

JPRS-UIA-87-039

23 October 1987



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Soviet Union

International Affairs

Soviet Union

International Affairs

JPRS-ULA-87-039

CONTENTS

23 OCTOBER 1987

THIRD WORLD ISSUES

Review of Journal AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA No 6, 1987 [APN DAILY REVIEW, 26 Jun 87]	1
Roundtable Discusses Imperialism's Use of 'State Terrorism'	
[I. P. Blishchenko, N. V. Zhdanov, M. I. Lazarev, others; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA No 6, Jun 87]	2
Plenum of USSR Committee for Afro-Asian Solidarity	
[D. Pavlov; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 6, Jun 87]	8
Israeli Aggression Hit, Link Between 'Irangate', 1967 War Seen	
[L. Medvedko; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 6, Jun 87]	9
Iran, U.S. Accused of Blocking Settlement of Iran-Iraq War	
[A. Notin; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 6, Jun 87]	14
Commentary on Fabius Plan for Franco-FRG Integration [V. Bolshakov; PRAVDA, 28 Aug 87]	17
Articles Not Translated in AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA No 6, 1987	
[AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, Jun 87]	19
Indian Author's Book on Sikh Separatism Reviewed	
[V. Kashin; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 6, Jun 87]	19
'Islamic Renewal', Decline of Secularism in Turkey Assailed	
[A. Stepanov; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 6, Jun 87]	20
'Neofascism' of Afrikaaner Resistance Movement Assailed	
[V. Molev; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 6, Jun 87]	22
Collective Monograph Examining Islam-Politics Link Reviewed	
[M. Roshchin; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 6, Jun 87]	26

WEST EUROPE

Commentary on Neofascism in Western Europe [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 2 Aug 87]	28
--	----

**Review of Journal AZIYA I AFRIKA
SEGODNYA No 6, 1987**

*18070379a Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English
26 Jun 87 pp 1-4*

[Text] "Dynamics of Growth" is the headline of an article by P. Shastitko and A. Kovalevski. Opening the issue, the article deals with social and economic transformations in Asia, Africa and Oceania between 1960 and 1985, changes in the alignment of class forces that, in their turn, led to political changes in the region, the major groups of states (socialist, developed capitalist and emergent countries), questions of theory, population, economic activities, and the evolution of international relations.

With the world numbering around ten small colonies and occupied territories, colonialism as a system of states and legal institutions is no more, the article says. Emergent countries also registered economic advance. Their aggregate Gross Domestic Product grew by 15 times from 90 billion dollars in 1960 to 1,346 billion dollars in 1985. However, it would be wrong to say that the region's economic record is free from problems. Along with nations which have successfully advanced in the economic field, there are tens of the least developed countries where the acute issues of hunger and poverty are tackled extremely slow.

Emergent countries constitute a specific community in historical and economic terms. They are still in the process of formation which fact is confirmed by the multiplicity of their social and class structure and their dependent and exploited position in the world capitalist economy. These countries reveal social and economic differentiation and proceed along different development roads.

A number of newly-free countries are socialism-oriented. Some of them, Ethiopia, Angola and Mozambique, in particular, have made big steps towards their goal. Others, numbering about ten in all (Benin, Congo, Syria, Madagascar, Tanzania, Guinea-Bissau, etc.) are yet at the beginning of the road. Their choice of socialism as the ultimate aim is a call of the times. This prospect also attracts other nations rejecting the agonising road of capitalism.

By itself the non-capitalist road does not dispense with the need for further revolutionary transformations. The major tasks facing the socialism-oriented states are to combat bureaucratic practices in the state machinery, foster the political initiative of the people and boost the efficiency of the public sector.

A. Medvedko's article "Aggression, Six Days and Twenty Years" deals with the 20th anniversary of Israel's "six-day" war against Arab countries. Unleashed unexpectedly and ended soon after it had begun, the war was prepared by the US-Israeli "strategic allies" for almost 20 years. Eventually, the war has taken the form

of aggression that continues for 20 years and no one can say when it will end. The "six-day" war has become a "watershed" of the Middle East conflict that started nearly 40 years ago. The war passed tornado-like. However, it started the endless chain of conflicts and dramas in the Middle East. As a result, a source of explosive tension persists there, generating an unabating threat to the region and the world as a whole.

The Lebanese crisis has further tightened the Mideast knot and compounded the situation in the Arab world. Intertwined in this crisis are many contradictions and outstanding issues stemming from the unsettledness of the Palestinian problem, Arab-Israeli confrontation, contradictions and a split among the Arab states themselves, intercommunity strife and the designs of local reactionary forces in Lebanon and the neocolonialist manoeuvres of imperialist states, their scramble for spheres of influence in the Middle East.

The Soviet stand on all regional conflicts, stresses the article, arises out of the USSR's principled and consistent policy for ending tension in different parts of the world through negotiation, with due regard for the legitimate interests of all sides and without any foreign interference. Only in this way is it possible to create a reliable basis for security in the Middle East and the Afro-Asian region as a whole, which is an important part of a comprehensive system of international security.

"Iran-Iraq. What Hinders a Settlement?" — thus is called the article of A. Notin.

The more ferocious fighting is on the fronts, the more obvious the danger of this protracted war for the belligerents themselves and for regional and international peace, notes the article. And the more urgent is the need for its early termination. External, as well as internal factors fuel the Iran-Iraq conflict. Today this is beyond doubt. US imperialism, NATO and their Middle Eastern allies want to preserve as long as possible a hotbed of war in the area which Western strategists call the "southern underbelly of the USSR."

The Irangate scandal has partly revealed the mechanism of the unscrupulous policy of Ronald Reagan's administration. This policy involves not so much secret deals, made with the knowledge and at the initiative of the White House, to sell American arms to the Khomeini regime, publicly declared the "enemy of America," as rendering direct military aid to both the belligerents in order to make the conflict still more fierce. The strategic aims of the double game of the US administration, undertaken to the detriment of the real interests of the peoples of Iraq and Iran, are clear, writes Notin. The escalation helps to steadily build up the American military-political presence in the Persian Gulf.

The dragging-on Iran-Iraq conflict has for the United States and its "strategic ally" — Israel — also an important political significance, as it distracts enormous

human and financial resources of the Arab world that could be directed into the struggle against Israeli expansionism. The schism is deepening among the Arab countries because of their different attitudes to the conflict. The international public's focus on the key issues of Middle Eastern settlement, and especially the Palestinian problem, is also weakening. In this context, the imperial plans of the US-Israel "strategic alliance" in the Middle East are becoming much easier to realise.

The Soviet Union, continues the author, is well aware of the danger this conflict poses for Iran and Iraq, the security and stability of their Persian Gulf neighbours and international peace as a whole. Throughout the six and a half years that it has been going on the USSR has energetically and consistently looked for political ways to resolve Iran-Iraq differences. The Soviet position is essentially that there are no insurmountable differences between the belligerents and that only imperialist forces stand to gain from a continuation of this war; the sooner the parties sit down at the negotiating table, the better it will be for Iraq and Iran, and for Middle Eastern peace.

The magazine also carries materials relating to a roundtable conference recently held in Moscow on the subject of "Outlaw State Terrorism!", an article by V. Molev, "South Africa. The Stormtroopers of Neofascism," and other materials.

12821

Roundtable Discusses Imperialism's Use of 'State Terrorism'

18070379d Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA
in Russian No 6, Jun 87 pp 15-20

[Materials from roundtable with Igor Pavlovich Blishchenko, chief of the International Law Department of the University of the Friendship of Peoples imeni P. Lumumba, vice president of the Association of Soviet Legal Scholars and UN expert on international law, and others: "Outlaw State Terrorism!" prepared for publication by Ye. Mora]

[Text] At the initiative of the Soviet Committee for Solidarity with the Countries of Asia and Africa, the Soviet Committee for Solidarity with the Peoples of Latin America and the Soviet Association of International Law, leading Soviet legal scholars discussed the topic "The Policy of State Terrorism—A Threat to the Peace and Security of Peoples" at a roundtable. This meeting included Doctor of Legal Sciences Igor Pavlovich Blishchenko, chief of the International Law Department of the University of the Friendship of Peoples imeni P. Lumumba, vice president of the Association of Soviet Legal Scholars and UN expert on international law, Candidate of Technical Sciences Nikolay Vasilyevich Zhdanov, docent of the Academy of Social Sciences of the CPSU Central Committee, Doctor of Legal Sciences Marklen Ivanovich Lazarev, senior academic staff member of the Latin America Institute of the USSR

Academy of Sciences, Doctor of Legal Sciences Vladimir Alekseyevich Kartashkin, senior academic staff member of the Institute of State and Law of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Academician Vladimir Nikolayevich Kudryavtsev, director of the Institute of State and Law of the USSR Academy of Sciences and vice president of the International Association of Jurists and Democrats, and USSR Academy of Sciences Corresponding Member Gleb Borisovich Starushenko, deputy director of the Africa Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

The presentations of the participants in the conference are reproduced below in abridged form.

V. Kudryavtsev: Today we must discuss one of the most shameful phenomena of contemporary life, a phenomenon that is unambiguously negative from the point of view of international law—the use of terroristic methods in international relations by imperialist reaction. Before we begin this discussion, however, I would like to remind you of the attitude of Marxism-Leninism toward terrorism. We communists have always renounced terror, both in domestic and international relations. The party of Lenin battled determinedly against the Socialist-Revolutionary concept of terror and any appearances of terrorists and clearly and unambiguously denounced terrorism as a phenomenon fundamentally alien to the methods of working class struggle for liberation and the national liberation struggle of peoples. This is well known not only from the statements of the classic authors of Marxism-Leninism, but also from the practical activity of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

I would also like to recall the draft resolution "On the Inadmissibility of Policies of State Terrorism and any Actions by States that are Aimed at Undermining the Socio-Political Structure in Other Sovereign States" that was presented by the Soviet government for the consideration of the 34th Session of the UN General Assembly in 1984. As is well known, 117 members of the UN supported the Soviet draft and just 30 abstained, including the United States, Israel, Chile and the American NATO allies. In the resolution that was adopted, state terrorism was defined as actions that are aimed at the violent change or subversion of the socio-political structure of sovereign countries and the destabilization and overthrow of their legal governments. All states are charged in particular with the obligation "not to begin, under any pretext whatsoever, military actions for this purpose and to immediately cease such actions already being carried out."

But what do we see in practice? A day doesn't go by in the Near East where the armed forces of Israel do not commit terroristic acts against the Palestinians and the civilian population of Lebanon. The policy of denying the national rights of the Palestinian people and state terror against them would be impossible without the blessing of the United States. The racist regime of South Africa, which is conducting a policy of terror and violence against the African population of the country, has

a criminal accomplice on the part of imperialist circles. The same is being done by the racists of Pretoria in Namibia. South Africa is continuing its undeclared war against Angola and Mozambique. These are namely gross and massive violations of the rights of man and of whole peoples that are being committed through the fault of imperialism in many countries and many regions of the world.

I would like to say something more. Reactionary circles of the imperialist states frequently incite or directly control terroristic acts for exclusively political purposes. It has become well known, for example, that CIA agents had long been hatching plans to assassinate the president of the People's Republic of Mozambique, Samora Mashela. The racists of South Africa, as testified to by many facts, accomplished this criminal design. In France, Italy and other Western countries, a splash of terrorism is being observed that is ascribed to leftist forces by the bourgeois organs of the press. In point of fact, the shadow of the various intelligence services of the West and the most reactionary circles of imperialism can be discerned behind many of the acts.

Terrorism is thus becoming not only a tool for implementing imperialist policy, but a means of discrediting progressive and democratic forces around the world. Recall, by way of example, the sensational attempt on the life of Pope John Paul II. Having subjected the "solitary terrorist" Agca to intense handling, the imperialist intelligence agencies used him for subversive activities against the socialist countries. But the "Bulgarian connection," just like the "hand of Moscow," turned out to be an elementary forgery, which the organizers of this anti-communist provocation themselves were ultimately forced to admit.

In the fight against state terrorism it is essential, in my opinion, to unite the efforts of all of progressive society and the whole international community. The key to the solution of this urgent problem could be a new manner of political thought, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was saying at the 27th CPSU Congress. We must clearly imagine what new agreements need to be developed and concluded and what new acts of international law, conventions and other documents could become an effective means in the struggle against terrorism.

I think that those attending our meeting today will speak in more detail on this and many other problems.

G. Starushenko: We pose the question: who does imperialist propaganda call the chief agent or, if you like, executors of the policy of state terrorism? First and foremost, the countries of the developing world. And therein, as Vladimir Nikolayevich has mentioned in a somewhat different context, they shift the blame onto the Soviet Union and other socialist countries for supporting the states of Africa, Asia and Latin America that are supposedly guilty of conducting such policies.

The developing countries are becoming the targets of such attacks only because the processes of social, and sometimes, national, liberation, proceeding in difficult and contradictory fashion, have yet to be completed there. These or those phenomena that exist there from time to time, artificially linked with a policy of state or individual terror, should be considered in strict accordance with the socially accepted principles of international relations that make up modern international law.

The fight for national liberation and against racism and foreign occupation have nothing in common with terrorism. These are legal methods of struggle, since all peoples have the right to self-determination (UN Charter, Article 1, Clause 2). Proceeding from the fact that modern international law has declared colonialism and racism to be unlawful, the UN General Assembly confirmed the "inalienable right of colonial peoples to fight with all existing means at their disposal against the colonial powers that suppress their aspirations for freedom and independence" (Resolution 2621/XXV). If the wars of Lebanon are classed as terrorism, it is possible to agree that the appearance of many dozens of new states in the postwar period is of an illegal nature, since they gained independence as a result of the armed struggle of their peoples. An accusation, say, against Angola and other frontline states of terrorism for the reason that they support the liberation struggle of the peoples of South Africa is clearly without substance, as are attempts to classify the struggle of the African National Congress against racism and apartheid as terroristic.

Bourgeois propaganda is trying to accuse those peoples of terrorism that are waging a struggle against foreign occupation or are repelling foreign aggression. This includes, by way of example, the population of a number of territories in the Arab states occupied by Israel. But this is the same as calling terroristic the Resistance movement that existed in a number of Western European countries during their occupation by Hitler's troops during the Second World War. No one would doubt the lawfulness of this liberation struggle of the people.

The assistance that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is rendering to sovereign countries that are subjected to foreign aggression and have become the targets of undeclared wars on the part of is also legal from the point of view of international law. The discussion in this case concerns Afghanistan, Angola, Nicaragua and several other countries whose people are defending their liberty and independence with weapon in hand. In these countries, revolutions have triumphed and legal governments have come to power that have the full right to appeal to whomever they wish for any assistance. Based on Article 51 of the UN Charter, every sovereign state has the right to individual and collective self-defense. It has the right to appeal for foreign assistance, and other states have the right to render it.

And, finally, there is another type of liberation struggle in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America that imperialism and reaction are especially doggedly placing

in the category of terroristic. These are the political and social revolutions that, being an internal affair of each state, were not before regulated by international law. But now the right of peoples to be the full master of their country, including the right to revolutionary transformations, is clearly provided for in the UN Charter, as well as in other international treaties and declarations. It is also confirmed by the Conference on Security and Collaboration in Europe. "Proceeding from the principle of equality under the law and the right of peoples to decide their fate," says the concluding document of this conference, "all peoples always have the right to determine, under conditions of complete freedom when and how ever they wish, their domestic and foreign political status without outside interference and to carry out at their discretion their political, economic, social and cultural development."

It is important to note that the sympathy of the Soviet Union has been always on the side of peoples that are defending their right to independence and social progress.

In answering the questions of correspondents during a press conference at the Elysee Palace on 4 Oct 85, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said: "We do not hide our position. When in this or that country a people chooses the path of progressive transformations and strives to develop its own independent policies, form its interpretation of the spiritual world and create its economic institutions, we welcome it. We are on the side of those peoples."

Strictly, this is none other than a manifestation of proletarian internationalism, which has always corresponded to the generally accepted principles and norms of international relations in the policies of our state. From the aforementioned it is clear that liberation movements have nothing in common with international terrorism, and they can be accused of it only out of bad intentions.

I. Blishchenko: I agree completely with Gleb Borisovich that only in the presence of ill will can national liberation movements be included among terroristic movements, as was done, for example, by former U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig, who declared that the fight against such movements "will become the paramount task of the U.S. administration in the near future." Washington adheres to this position even today.

Meanwhile, the legality of the national liberation movements of peoples has been recognized not only by the UN, but also by a whole series of special international-legal documents that all states, including the United States, have agreed to. Thus, the supplementary protocol on international armed conflict to the Geneva Convention in Defending the Victims of War in 1949 in particular states that a conflict is considered to be international when "the peoples are waging a struggle against

colonial rule, foreign occupation or against racist regimes in implementing their right to self-determination as fixed in the UN Charter."

I would like to note that the term "international terrorism" is a quite capacious concept that encompasses a wide spectrum of every possible manifestation of terrorism. And of course, the most dangerous of them is state terrorism. But state terrorism is also not unambiguous, it is manifested in various forms. I would delineate three varieties of it. First of all, it is terrorism that is carried out by the armed forces of one state in the form of an armed attack or aggression against another sovereign state. Second, it is terrorism in the form of secret subversive operations by the intelligence agencies of the imperialist powers against state political or social figures, as well as against the people of this or that country. And, finally, it is state terrorism in the form of criminal acts, the acts of dictatorial regimes against their own people, their countrymen. I will elaborate my idea with concrete examples.

The first two types of state terrorism are clearly embodied in the so-called doctrine or concept of "neoglobalism" that was developed and is being put into practice by the current Washington administration. The discussion concerns a doctrine that openly proclaims the "right" of the United States to armed or covert intervention in those regions of the globe where Washington sees the presence of "a threat to the national interests of the United States." Being discussed here first and foremost is the "right" to interfere in the internal affairs of Asian, African and Latin American countries for the purpose of overthrowing governments unacceptable to the U.S. administration or, on the contrary, keeping dictatorial regimes obedient to Washington in power that have been challenged by national liberation movements in those countries.

In a certain sense, this doctrine represents a new phenomenon in world politics. As is well known, a cult of force and a bet on military blackmail and aggression have always been the foundation of the foreign policies of exploiter states. New in the doctrine is the effort to camouflage its interventionist thrust with the essential motivation of "fighting international terrorism." It is no accident that it is often called the "doctrine of counter-terrorism" in the ruling circles of the United States.

The chief and definitive thing in the doctrine of "neoglobalism" is its all-encompassing nature, out of which arises the global nature of its lack of correspondence to the norms of international law and the UN Charter. Thus, the Declaration on the Principles of International Law adopted unanimously by the UN General Assembly in 1970 stipulates that all states are "obliged to refrain from actions that are associated with the use of force."

How is the United States fulfilling these international legal documents? It is enough to say that practically the whole Near East has today been turned into a zone of

permanent American aggression. And not only American. The years 1948, 1956, 1967, 1973 and 1982 are the years of the five Israeli anti-Arab wars that flouted the sovereignty of the Arabs and all international legal norms. The United States itself, under the current administration, has committed aggressive and criminal acts against Lebanon and Libya. And what of the aggression of Washington against Grenada, which was practically unanimously (108 votes versus nine) condemned in the UN?

It is fully comprehensible that the secret operations of the imperialist intelligence agencies against sovereign states are also beyond the bounds of legality. We will turn to the activity of the CIA. The overthrow of Mossadegh in Iran. The assassination of Patrice Lumumba in the Congo. The repeated attempts on the life of Fidel Castro. The preparation of fascist putsches in Chile and the assassination of Salvador Allende. Under the current Washington administration, the CIA has turned out to be connected with such evil deeds as the attempt to assassinate President K. Kaunda of Zambia, the demise of the commander in chief of the national guard of Panama, Gen Torrijos, as a result of an airplane crash, plans and attempts to assassinate the leader of Libya, Muammar Khaddafi, and many others. The tentacles of the CIA spread practically across the whole world. The chief attention of the organizers of the "special operations" is devoted to the fight against national liberation movements and against socialism. The CIA financed the detachments of Holden Roberto in Angola. It is now sending terrorists to Angola, Ethiopia, Mozambique and other African countries, "supporting" the underground activities against liberation forces in Central and South America and building intrigues in the Near and Middle East.

M. Lazarev: The term "state terrorism" that has arisen in recent years still has no clear legal description. The task of legal scholars and democrats is to define more fully in what forms and by what means state terrorism is accomplished, who are the subjects and objects of its manifestations, what its goals are etc. The staff members representing my Latin America Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences are also working on resolving this task.

What is terrorism? The concept itself comes from the Latin word "terror"—"fear, horror." International law considers terrorism to be killings or other infringements on the life and health of heads of state and governments, members of diplomatic missions or individual citizens for the purpose of having an effect on the policies of this or that country, the kidnaping of foreign diplomats or citizens, the hijacking or destruction of aircraft and the like.

State terrorism is a more complex sort of phenomenon. Political practice in Latin America gives much confirmation of this. It is namely in Latin America that the United States has undertaken the greatest number of

interventions against sovereign states. And it is namely here that the violation of human rights and the suppression of democratic freedoms is most widespread.

It seems that there are no crimes that dictators and tyrants will not commit against their own countrymen. But here is what a member of the U.S. State Department, P. Walters, recently declared: "The governments of the Latin American dictators are allies of the United States and pose no threat to the United States..." At the same time, Washington considers governments that have come to power as a result of the ascent of the national liberation struggles of this or that people, as a result of revolution, to be hostile to its own interests.

The goal of state terrorism as used against such governments is to impede the advance of the people along the path of peace and social progress. The imperialists are unfailingly guided therein by the interests of the large monopolies, and first and foremost the interests of the military concerns. The policy of the main imperialist power—the United States—is aimed not at ensuring the principal right of man—the right to life—but rather to expanding the possibilities for depriving him of this right. It is not important what form it takes—the dispatch of an armada of naval vessels to foreign shores, the delivery of weapons to dictatorial regimes or the employment of economic sanctions.

I would also like to direct the attention of those attending to the fact that there are many definitions of the concepts of "international terrorism" and "state terrorism." But a convention or other document that contains a complete collective definition of these concepts has still not been developed. The growth of terrorism in various corners of the planet that is being observed in recent years makes the development of such a convention an exceptionally urgent task.

N. Zhdanov: I would like to dwell on individual instances of state terrorism apropos of the situation in the Near East. According to the calculations of specialists, over the last decade the quantity of terroristic acts as a percentage is broken down by regions as follows: about 50 percent were committed in Western Europe, 20-25 percent in Latin America and 11-14 percent in the Near East. If one takes into account the correlation of the population of these regions, the Near East is a very "hot" spot on the planet in a terrorism sense. I would add to this that perhaps nowhere in the postwar period have there arisen so many crises, and nowhere have there broken out so many armed conflicts, as in the Near East.

The Near East crisis arose in and of itself as a result of the unlawful activities of the United States and Israel. Washington, as is well known, is striving to establish its undivided control over the oil resources of the region, using Israel as its strategic ally for the achievement of this aim. Terroristic acts therein, in whoever's name they are committed, serve to assist Washington in reinforcing its positions in the Near East. Also typical is the fact that

at the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s, the United States strove persistently to appropriate for itself the right to intervene in various international conflicts and to manage the processes of inciting them or, on the contrary, settle them, but without any regard therein for the positions of all of the interested parties, especially the Palestinian people.

Not only is the military might of the United States itself or the threat of its employment used for this, but so is military power or blackmail on the part of Israel to a lesser extent. I want to note that Tel Aviv and Washington have identical legal conceptions of the Near East, a similar or identical set of military and political means of intervention and largely coincident goals and methods of achieving them. It is no accident that after the defeat of Israel in the war of 1956, the United States first gave it nuclear technology as compensation. Israel currently has nuclear weapons, according to the testimony of the world press, and thus nuclear blackmail is an indispensable element of the aggressive policies of Tel Aviv in the Near East region, providing it with definite impunity in committing acts of state terrorism.

I agree with the opinion of those here on the necessity of developing conventions for defining international and state terrorism, although I foresee serious difficulties on that path. The practice of prosecuting international crime sooner requires a concrete definition of the elements of the crime. The conventional direction is most promising in such situations, since it gives the most appreciable results of international legal collaboration of different states.

It is exceedingly import to fix legally, say, the distinction of an act of aggression versus an act of state terrorism. An act of state terrorism is not only an act of aggression and not only the illegal use of force from the point of view of international law, but it is also the threat of it in the future against a sovereign state that does not intend to alter its positions on this or that issue.

It is also essential to note that acts of state terrorism are committed, as a rule, under conditions of the military superiority of the subject over the victim of the attack, that is, under conditions of an absence of military responsibility and legal consequences for the committing of such acts. A dangerous precedent is being created in international relations—the permission of everything, impunity, the tolerance of terrorism. Small states are losing faith in the capability of international law to ensure their security, and trends toward forming blocs are growing stronger at the regional and international levels.

V. Kartashkin: I agree with you completely, Nikolay Vasilyevich. It is namely the increasing aggressiveness of imperialism that is one of the reasons for the strengthening of trends toward forming blocs among a number of Asian, African and Latin American countries. That is

why I would like to dwell in my presentation on such a dangerous form of state terrorism as the direct application of the armed forces in the practice of international relations.

I am deeply convinced that international legal responsibility should be stipulated for state terrorism of this type, notwithstanding the current absence of the corresponding treaties and conventions. After all, if we analyze terroristic actions associated with the direct use of the armed forces of, say, the United States, we become convinced that they undoubtedly fall under the definition of aggression as accepted by the international community. Article 2 of the UN Charter thus forbids any threat of force or its application against the territorial inviolability or political independence of any state. In the special act adopted by the UN General Assembly on 14 Dec 74 titled "A Definition of Aggression," it says that "a war of aggression is a crime against international peace." How the imperialist powers follow the letter and spirit of these documents has already been spoken of before me by Igor Pavlovich Blishhenko. I would like to add to it examples of such public instances as the war of the United States and the other capitalist states for the purpose of eliminating socialist gains in North Korea, the aggression of six countries headed by the United States in Indochina, the U.S. incursion into Cuba, the attack of England, France and Israel on Egypt, the combat operations of the United States, England and Belgium in the Congo and so on and so forth.

All of these acts of aggression can be described as acts of state terrorism. Both political and material liability must be stipulated for state terrorism, which is, like aggression, an international crime. Political liability can be expressed in various forms including, by way of example, the demilitarization of a portion of the territory of the aggressor state. Material liability can be expressed in the obligation of this state to compensate the victim of the damage caused. The specific individuals that are guilty of unleashing war should furthermore bear international criminal responsibility. By the way, the Nuremberg and Tokyo proceedings, as well as the trial of mercenaries in Luanda, clearly demonstrated that the imperialists do not always commit criminal acts in the international arena without being punished.

I join the opinion of my colleagues that have gathered at this roundtable today of the insistent necessity of developing and adopting an international document that would regulate the problem of responsibility for state terrorism and would serve as a caution to the forces of imperialism and reaction that are conducting policies of state terrorism.

In conclusion I would like to cite the words of M.S. Gorbachev in the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Party Congress: "Today it is important as never before to find ways for closer and more productive collaboration with the governments, parties and public organizations and movements that are

really concerned about the fate of peace on Earth and with all peoples for the sake of creating an all-encompassing system of international security." One of the fundamental bases of this system in the political realm is the development of effective methods of averting international terrorism.

From the Editors: The roundtable conference has ended. Its participants naturally cannot illuminate all aspects of the proposed topic, and they have not pretended to do so. They have expressed views that do not always coincide and, probably, are not always incontrovertible. But the opinion of the necessity of outlawing state terrorism was a common one.

This is the persistent demand of the times. Yesterday, accusing Tripoli of supporting terrorism, Washington unceremoniously and impertinently used state terrorism against the Libyans. Today they are groundlessly accusing Syria of terrorism, trying, once again using the practice of state terrorism, to "punish" a sovereign Arab state for its independent policies that are hindering the realization of imperialist plans in the Near East. Who will be the next victim of the policies of the West in the developing world tomorrow?

The most reactionary circles in the United States are trying to substantiate the policy of state terrorism and diverse actions directed at undermining the political and social institutions in this or that country with the aid of the concept of "neoglobalism," "a crusade against communism," "policy from a position of strength" and the like. The groundlessness of such, could it be said, "theoretical" constructs is obvious from the point of view of international law. The Soviet Union feels that the UN General Assembly should condemn and categorically repudiate such concepts. This must be done so as to defend the peoples of the developing countries from state terrorism and reinforce both the security of individual states and international security overall.

Imperialism is still a strong, experienced and extremely cunning enemy of the peoples of the liberated countries. "The path of political maneuvering, promises and bribes, military threats and blackmail, and frequently direct interference in the internal affairs of the liberated countries has largely permitted capitalism to succeed in preserving the earlier extant relations of economic dependence," it was emphasized in the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Party Congress. (1)

In our time, however, the imperialists no longer determine the main directions for the development of mankind. Formerly the helpless objects of imperialist policies, the developing countries have today entered onto the road of independent historical creation. And any attempts to slow social progress with the aid of terror and violence will inevitably turn against their organizers and be subjected to condemnation on the part of the progressive forces of the planet. Thus, the topic of the use of

mercenaries as a variety of state terrorism, widely employed by the imperialist powers and touched on in the presentation of I.P. Blishchenko, was reflected after the conclusion of the roundtable conference in the discussion at the 6th Session of the UN Special Committee on the Development of an International Convention on the Fight against the Recruiting, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries that took place at the beginning of this year.

Many of the participants in the discussion at the UN noted that the imperialist states are using hundreds and thousands of mercenaries to participate in the undeclared wars against Nicaragua, Afghanistan, Angola, Kampuchea and other countries. No rules have been written for these "soldiers of fortune," and they are committing the cruelest of crimes against the civilian population in those areas where they have been sent by the intelligence agencies of the West. The UN has repeatedly and decisively condemned mercenaries in its resolutions as contradicting such fundamental principles of international law as the non-application of force or the threat of force, the equality and self-determination of peoples and the sovereign equality of states. By way of example, a resolution was adopted at the 41st UN General Assembly that condemned mercenaries as a threat to international peace and security.

The international convention being developed against mercenaries, declared USSR First Deputy Permanent Representative to the UN R.M. Timerbayev in the course of the discussion, is called upon to serve as an important international legal document that protects the sovereignty of states and peoples from the criminal acts of hired terrorists. The convention would serve as a valuable contribution of the UN to reinforcing peace and creating a system of all-encompassing international security.

The issue of state terrorism was the subject of a serious discussion at the highest level when negotiations were held between party and governmental delegations of the USSR and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen headed by the Yemeni Socialist Party Central Committee General Secretary A.S. al-Beyd that took place in Moscow in the spring of this year. AS CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev noted, "in the Arab East it has become a sort of norm to resort to force and armed actions, trying with the aid of them to impose imperialist 'order' in someone else's house. The scandalous aggression against Libya and the gross blackmail in relations with Syria are fresh in everyone's mind. Massive concentrations of U.S. naval forces are occurring today in the eastern Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf region.

"Threats are openly sounded and put into circulation... so as to 'punish' a people and state for the foolhardy and criminal actions of a handful of terrorists.

"Terrorism is a truly terrible evil and a scourge of our times. But trying to uproot it with the aid of state terrorism means to commit an even greater crime, because the victim is an ever greater number of human lives, the sovereignty of states and international law, not to mention conventional morality and justice. As a result, a vicious circle of violence and bloodshed arises."
(2)

In our opinion, the participants in the conference have raised in very timely fashion the issue of the necessity of developing a code in which acts of state terrorism could be classified as a severe violation of international law that threatens universal peace and the security of peoples.

Footnotes

1. Materials of the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Moscow, 1986, p. 16.

2. PRAVDA, 11 Feb 87.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1987. Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

12821

Plenum of USSR Committee for Afro-Asian Solidarity

18070379c Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA
in Russian No 6, Jun 87 p 25

[Article by D. Pavlov under the rubric "The Motto—Solidarity": "Not Dwelling on What Has Been Achieved"]

[Text] The plenum of the Soviet Committee of Afro-Asian Solidarity (SCAAS) that was held in Moscow was devoted to a discussion of topical problems in the anti-imperialist movement.

A report was made by V.G. Tolstikov, first deputy chairman of the committee. The restructuring that has been unfurled in the country since the 27th CPSU Congress, given new impetus by the January (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, said the speaker, has embraced all spheres of our activity, both domestic and foreign-policy. The Soviet participants in the movement for Afro-Asian solidarity completely approve and support the political line of the party for restructuring, actively bringing it to life.

A key problem of modern times—the preservation and strengthening of peace on Earth—occupies, noted the speaker, a central place in the activity of the SCAAS and the whole solidarity movement. Paramount attention is devoted to this problem at all of the international forums of the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organization (AAPSO). We have achieved definite successes. This is

not enough today, however. It is essential to make more active the collaboration of the vanguard of Afro-Asian solidarity with other social and intergovernmental organizations, especially the non-aligned movement, which will further the involvement of new social forces in our ranks, especially religious ones—Muslim, Buddhist etc.

Also deserving of serious attention is the issue of strengthening work among the peasantry. It comprises about three fourths of the population of the countries of Asia and Africa, but is frequently beyond the political influence of progressive forces. Remaining a passive part of society, the peasantry frequently falls under the influence of conservative circles.

An important aspect of the activity of the solidarity movement, as noted in the report, is the interconnection between disarmament and development. The use of the enormous resources that are swallowed up by the arms race today for purposes of socio-economic progress meets the interests of the young states. This interconnection is an important proof in favor of the activation of peace-loving forces in the liberated countries.

We are devoting considerable attention to this problem, but we still have unutilized reserves as well. The conditions have ripened, said the speaker, for the more effective participation of the solidarity movement, including the Soviet academic community, in the broad worldwide struggle for restructuring international economic relations using fair and democratic principles and for the establishment of a new international economic order.

A considerable portion of the report was devoted to the Asiatic direction of the activity of the Afro-Asian solidarity movement. Due to various causes, the AAPSO has in recent years devoted little attention to Asia. Moreover, this continent, where the principles of pancha shila were formulated, whence the ideas of Bandung came, where 40 years ago the very anti-imperialist solidarity movement was born and where the historic Delhi declaration was signed, is deserving of more attention on the part of progressive forces. The speaker gave concrete suggestions for making the work of the SCAAS more active in the Asian countries.

Humanity is on the eve of a great political event—the 70th Anniversary of Great October. With the active participation of our committee, said V.G. Tolstikov, much work is being done in the Afro-Asian solidarity movement to facilitate widespread illumination of the worldwide historical significance of October and its stimulating influence on the liberation struggle of the peoples of the Orient.

In discussing the report, SCAAS Deputy Chairman and USSR Academy of Sciences Corresponding member G.F. Kim spoke of the necessity of the committee finding new forms of work and active involvement in the solidarity movement and the antiwar struggle of the

social forces of the Afro-Asian world. He dwelled on the issue of Soviet press propaganda on experience in the building of socialist society, especially in the republics of the Soviet Orient. The significance of counter-propaganda features in our press is growing today, and it is obligated to expose imperialist propaganda, feeding off some negative phenomena that have been exposed in the restructuring of our country, in a reasoned manner.

RSFSR Council of Ministers First Deputy Chairman F.A. Tabev devoted his presentation to the specific nature of the socio-political situation in the countries of the Orient and called for the more active restructuring of work in accordance with the new political thinking. Maximum attention to the national cultures of the peoples of the Orient and their traditions should be displayed, he said. The tasks of the struggle for peace and disarmament must be bound up with the immediate needs of the peoples of the Afro-Asian countries.

SCAAS Deputy Chairman and USSR Academy of Sciences Corresponding Member An. A. Gromyko spoke on the role of the solidarity movement in reinforcing political independence, the economic decolonization of the countries of Africa and assisting the struggle of the peoples of the southern part of the continent against apartheid and racism.

Tajik SSR Academy of Sciences President and Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences M.S. Asimov related the activity of the republic solidarity committee and noted that its work should be coordinated more closely with the SCAAS. The deputy chairman of the APN [Novosti Press Agency] Board, K.A. Khachaturov, and Doctor of Philosophical Sciences V.D. Granov devoted their presentations to the informational-propaganda aspect of the activity of the SCAAS.

The deputy chairman of the Leningrad City Soviet of People's Deputies, V.P. Vorolomeyev, related the work of the Leningrad SCAAS activists with foreign delegations—guests of the Soviet committee. The deputy director of the World Economy's and International Relations Institute, Doctor of Historical Sciences A.K. Kislov, spoke on the areas of activity of the SCAAS in the Near East and Africa.

The plenum approved the SCAAS Charter. Organizational issues were reviewed. The request of M.A. Ibragimov to release him from the duties of chairman of the SCAAS for health reasons was approved. Doctor of Historical Sciences M.S. Kapitsa, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Oriental Studies Institute, was elected chairman of the SCAAS.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1987. Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka".

12821

Israeli Aggression Hit, Link Between 'Irangate', 1967 War Seen

18070379b Moscow. AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA in Russian No. 6, Jun 87 pp. 5-9

[Article by Doctor of Economic Sciences L. Medvedko under the rubric "Near East": "Aggression—Six Days and Twenty Years"]

[Text] Some 20 years have passed since the beginning of Israel's "Six-Day War" against the Arab countries. It was unleashed unexpectedly and completed in blitzkrieg fashion, although it had been prepared by the American and Israeli "strategic allies" over the course of almost two decades. It spilled over into the subsequent twenty years of aggression that still sees no end. The Six-Day War thus was a distinctive "watershed" of the Near East conflict that has gone on for almost 40 years. The war rushed passed like the wind. But the seeds of violence it sowed produced poisonous shoots that have dragged the Near East into the abyss of endless conflicts and disturbances. As a result, not only does it remain an explosive seat of tension today, but it is growing worse, creating a threat both to the peoples of the region and the whole world.

A Look through the Prism of "Irangate"

It is always difficult to draw a precise boundary between current policies and recent history. It seems that events of twenty years ago should by now have become the property of the past. But the lava of the Near Eastern volcano has not hardened. Over the last two decades, it has repeatedly erupted in newer and ever more bloody and destructive wars, crises and conflicts. The majority of them could be considered a direct continuation of the aggression unleashed by Israel in June of 1976. They are the Jordanian-Palestinian tragedy of 1970, the October War of 1973, the Israeli incursion into Lebanon in 1978 and the new aggression against Lebanon in 1982. Under the conditions of the still unfinished civil war there, it has been transformed into the most prolonged crisis in the Near East. The evolution of similar crises, dangerous for the whole Arab liberation movement, can be discerned particularly clearly based on the example of this country.

Although Lebanon was the sole Arab state neighboring Israel that did not take part in the June 1967 war, it soon became the center of the Near East conflict, the heart of which is the unresolved nature of the Palestinian problem. It not only was and remains the most sensitive and explosive component of the Arab-Israeli conflict overall, but a dangerous detonator for internal conflicts provoked by the American-Israeli "strategic allies" and the local reaction of some Arab countries in which the Palestinians are forced to live as well. That is just how events have transpired in Lebanon, where the civil war has served as grounds for the unleashing of new Israeli aggression and American-NATO armed intervention that aims the tip of its spear against the Palestinians.

The collective aggression has not, however, achieved its chief aim—the elimination of the Palestinian resistance movement—but it has undoubtedly inflicted an appreciable blow to it and has deepened the schism within its ranks. It is namely this lack of unity that has begun to be utilized subsequently to inflame the civil war and increase the powerful grip of the United States and Israel on Lebanon and Syria. The crisis in Lebanon has already gone on for over ten years. The volcano spews its sparks in all directions, starting new fires in many regions from the shores of the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf.

If one judges by the intentions of Washington and Tel Aviv in throwing gasoline on the fire of the Iran-Iraq war, it could also be included among the "satellites" of the Near East conflict. The events of late associated with Irangate have shed new light not only on the Iran-Iraq conflict itself, but on the underhanded aspects of the preparations for the Israeli aggression of 1967 against the Arab countries. Irangate makes it possible to regard in a different way many of the "secrets" of the Arab-Israeli wars and reveal the mechanism for the sharing of roles by the United States and Israel both in the preparation of these wars and in the sabotaging of a Near East settlement.

After his last visit to Washington in March of 1987, Israeli Prime Minister Shamir acknowledged that Israel had finally obtained the status of an "important ally" of the United States on a par with the other members of NATO. There is nothing surprising in this "admission." The foundation of strategic collaboration between Washington and Tel Aviv had been laid long ago.

After the rout of the armed Anglo-American intervention against Lebanon and Jordan in 1958 and the vain attempts to overthrow anti-imperialist governments in the Arab world via coups, the United States and its NATO partners began in the 1960s to place increasing bets on the Zionist leaders of Israel. The West always saw an opportunity to exert constant pressure on the Arab countries, especially on those where progressive regimes were in power, in the expansionism, aggressiveness and colonial ambitions of Tel Aviv. By the beginning of the 1960s, Israel, thanks to the broad material support of imperialism and world Zionism, was already strong enough to attempt to act independently as the gendarme in the fight against the Arab liberation movement and begin the realization of the cherished goal of the Zionists, who were dreaming of a "greater Israel" with borders "from the Nile to the Euphrates."

The combat capabilities of the Israeli army, thanks to the aid of the West, has allowed Washington to reconsider the role of Tel Aviv in the global strategic plans of imperialism in the Near East. Whereas at the beginning of the 1960s Israel was considered to be just one of the participants in the interventionist and punitive acts of imperialism against the Arab liberation movement within the framework of the aggressive doctrines of "throwback" and "mass retribution," since the middle

of the 1960s Tel Aviv, in accordance with the doctrine of "flexible response," has become an independent strike force for waging local wars in the interests of neocolonialism. The expansionist aspirations of the Zionist higher-ups in Israel are being implemented in practice more and more often in aggressive sallies and armed provocations by its military clique against the Arab countries. Washington's encouragement of these actions also ultimately led to the unleashing of the aggression of June 1967.

With the Blessing of America

The history of preparations for the Six-Day War is closely intertwined with contemporary policies and the Irangate affair. The point is not only and not so much that the same actors, pretty old but retaining their political activeness nonetheless, are on stage and in the wings in a number of cases. Whereas before they played the roles of the instigators of wars, today their role is to instigate dirty dealings (it is well known, for example, that S. Peres and Y. Rabin, currently members of the Israeli government and involved in Irangate, made their contribution to the preparations for the June 1967 war). Something else is more important. The unified direction of Washington, playing a double game, can be clearly discerned in the staging of these bloody shows. The organizers of these adventures, however, are ultimately doomed, to a double defeat.

The United States, giving its blessing to the unleashing of Israeli aggression, was counting on receiving political and military dividends in the Near East. As J. Badeau, the former ambassador of Washington to Egypt, testifies, however, "the special relationship of the United States and Israel was in favor neither of their special interests in the Arab countries nor the long-term goals of American policy in the Near East." (1) The same could be said about the consequences of Irangate for the long-term interests of the United States in this region.

Some Israeli and Western military historians are inclined to ascribe this to the "excessive ardor" of Tel Aviv that supposedly frequently "crosses the line planned by Washington." In order to prove the theory they advance, they refer to the fact that the plan initially coordinated with Washington envisaged having Israel strike Egypt alone with the subsequent occupation of Gaza and part of the Sinai Peninsula. This was felt to be quite sufficient to force the Arabs to capitulate or, at least, to open the Strait of Tiran. In reality, however, Tel Aviv had planned to strike Syria, Jordan and, if necessary, Lebanon right from the very beginning. The Israeli leaders, however, knew that some Western European countries objected to this, France in particular. Complete clarity in the possible reaction of Washington to Tel Aviv's "overfulfillment" of the agreed-upon plans was lacking.

That is why, at an extraordinary session of the council of ministers on May 27, only half of the members of the Israeli government voted to launch the war, while half voted to wait. Upon repeated voting the next day, after the warning of the USSR of the serious consequences of the war being prepared was relayed to Israel, almost all of the Israeli leadership aside from Generals Karmal and Kabin, present at the session as chief of the general staff, were in favor of a "continuation of diplomatic efforts."

Notwithstanding this, the Israeli army, as Rabin threateningly warned, was already prepared to wage war. It awaited not so much the order of the Israeli government as the blessing of the White House.

The United States, remembering the lessons of the Suez crisis of 1956, could of course not fail to take into account the possible negative consequences for it of the war unleashed "independently" by Israel against the Arab countries with the tacit support of the United States. In Washington, however, they were counting on the fact that these consequences would not be so severe for the American administration and, although not without trepidation, assured Israel of the support of the United States both in the course of the war and subsequently. Former president L. Johnson wrote in his memoirs that at a meeting with the Israeli minister of foreign affairs, A. Eban, on 26 May 67 he assured him of United States readiness to support any steps and "all possible efforts" to open the Strait of Tiran, then controlled by Egypt. (2)

Not long before this, on 23 May 67, Johnson had given reason to understand, in his declaration on the situation in the Middle East, that the United States was ready to support Israel in its war with the Arabs. This readiness was reinforced by concrete action. By the end of May, the principal forces of the U.S. Sixth Fleet were transferred into the eastern part of the Mediterranean: about 50 ships, including the aircraft carriers America, Saratoga and Intrepid, 200 aircraft and 25,000 sailors and Marines. Ten American ships were immediately dispatched to Malta and Greece on "courtesy calls." A formation of ships with an aircraft carrier were located in the Red Sea area.

Admiral Martin, commander of the Sixth Fleet, the same man who led the Marine landing in Lebanon in 1958, received a secret order to bring all of his forces to combat readiness for possible action in the Near East. At the same time, the American troops stationed at military bases in Turkey were brought to the highest combat readiness.

Making use of the element of surprise in attacking the Arab countries, the Israelis were able to seize the whole Sinai Peninsula, the Gaza strip and the eastern bank of the Suez Canal, the Golan Heights of Syria and the West Bank of the Jordan River in six days. Overall, they occupied over 60,000 square kilometers, that is, territory three times larger than that occupied by Israel within its

1949 borders. The Israeli aggression inflicted untold misfortunes on the Arab countries. Tens of thousands of dead and wounded, thousands of destroyed homes, dozens of industrial enterprises halted. Hundreds of thousands of people, deprived of their livestock, ended up in Palestinian refugee camps in Jordan, Syria and Lebanon, already overflowing. The damage caused by the war totals billions of dollars.

Notwithstanding the military defeat of the Arab countries in 1967, the Israeli aggression led in political and economic terms to results that were largely totally opposite to the goals for the sake of which it was conceived. The progressive Arab regimes were able to stand their ground, while the Palestinian resistance movement became more active. The aggressors were also unable to undermine Arab-Soviet collaboration.

The reputation of the Soviet Union, decisively on the side of the Arabs and supporting their just struggle against aggression, grew considerably, while the positions of the imperialist states, and first and foremost the United States, came to be undermined in the Arab world. After the first of the Israeli air strikes against Cairo and Damascus, powerful anti-imperialist demonstrations took place spontaneously in almost all of the Arab capitals, spilling over first and foremost into speeches with an anti-American thrust. The majority of the Arab countries severed diplomatic relations with the United States, England and West Germany. The oil-exporting Arab countries halted for a time (until August 1967) the delivery of oil to the United States, England and other Western states that supported Israel.

Israel had become the aggressor in the eyes of the whole world. They were repudiated by many that had earlier empathized or sympathized with them, including the United States and Western Europe. At the same time, as demonstrated by subsequent events, especially the October War of 1973 and the armed intervention in Lebanon, borders that were far "removed" did not at all ensure the tranquility of Israel. They did not even become a truce line, turning rather into a front line of the actually unceasing military operations. It could be said that over the almost 40 years of its existence, Israel has not spent a single day at peace. The wars that were waged by the Zionists since the beginning to "ensure independence" and then to "reinforce security" have had the opposite result. Israel is becoming more and more dependent on American imperialism and is living in constant uncertainty for its future, which cannot in any way be considered secure while Israel itself constantly threatens not only its Arab neighbors, but many North African states as well. All of this is most convincing proof of the insolvency of the ideology of Zionism and the bankruptcy of both its political and military doctrines.

The aggressiveness of Tel Aviv after the Six-Day War of 1967 has increased even further. It was not moderated by the October War of 1973. It was followed by the "Fifth Arab-Israeli War" of 1982 in Lebanon. "The bulwark of

democracy"—as they love to call Israel in the West—had been transformed into a beachhead for militarism and aggression that has gone on for over a decade.

The Israeli war against the Arabs in June of 1967, however, occupies a special place in the development of the Near East conflict. It opened up a qualitatively new stage of it: in the course of the struggle to eliminate the consequences of the aggression, a general Arab consolidation of forces began not only on an anti-Zionist basis, but on an anti-imperialist one as well.

Insofar as this struggle was led by the progressive Arab countries against whom the aggression was directly aimed, the Arab-Israeli conflict acquired an even more clearly expressed class nature. The fight of the Arabs against Israeli aggression, actively on whose side were the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist community, on a global level became a constituent element of the world anti-imperialist front. On a regional plane, the countries subjected to Israeli aggression, notwithstanding the military failures, were able to defend and, to a certain extent, even to reinforce the progressive regimes.

Subsequent events in the Near East—be they strikes against Lebanon and Libya, blackmail against Syria, the intervention of the United States and Israel in the Iran-Iraq war or the concentration of U.S. naval forces in the eastern Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf region—have signified new and alarming trends in the evolution of the regional crises engendered by the Near East conflict: their scale is expanding, they are more and more difficult to control and they threaten international security.

How To Break the Vicious Circle

The crisis in Lebanon has not only become a component of the Near East conflict, but also to a considerable extent a mirror and barometer of it. The principal stages of the Lebanese tragedy—the periodic fading and outbursts of armed clashes within the country, as well as the scale of aggressive acts by Israel against Lebanon and the degree of pressure it is subjected to by Washington—reflect various stages of American policy and strategy with regard to the Arab world.

Every time the imperialists place a bet on neocolonialist methods of deepening the schism, on a distinctive "Arabization" of the Near East conflict, setting Arab against Arab, Lebanon has become one of the "hot spots" of the Arab East. Earlier, however, internal political disturbances were provoked within the country for the purpose of creating a pretext for military intervention by one of the strategic allies—the United States or Israel. In the 1980s they not only began to carry out, in essence, collective armed intervention in Lebanon, but also dragged some of the NATO countries into it. Having in

this manner shifted the center of the Near East conflict to Lebanon, they tried to transform it into a sort of proving ground for trying out the hegemonist strategy of "neoglobalism."

The Lebanese crisis has further tightened the knot of the Near East problem and complicated the situation in the Arab world. Many contradictions and unresolved issues associated with the unsettled nature of the Palestinian problem, the Arab-Israeli confrontation, the contradictions and schisms among the Arab states themselves, intercommunal differences and the intrigues of local reactionary forces in Lebanon, as well as with the neo-colonial maneuvers of the imperialist states and their competitive struggle for a sphere of influence in the Near East, are intertwined in this crisis.

Imperialism, Zionism and right-wing Christian circles, having drawn the Palestinian movement and Syria into the Lebanese crisis, are striving to bleed them dry in fratricidal warfare, push aside the anti-imperialist struggle and at the same time reinforce the positions of local reaction.

The interconnection of the Lebanese crisis and the unsettled nature of the Near East conflict and the continuing Iran-Iraq war are more and more manifested in the dangerous turn that events took after Irangate. The consequences, as yet not eliminated, of the Israeli aggression and the intestine struggle in Lebanon are having a material effect not only on the course of military conflict of the warring parties, but also on the disposition of political forces both in the Arab countries and in Iran.

Today Israel not openly acts in a coalition with the United States and some NATO countries in the Near and Middle East, but in concert with local reaction as well. The Palestinian resistance movement, against which the Israeli aggression has always been directed, has been forced to be based principally just on the leftist forces in Lebanon and the support of the progressive Arab states. Such a disposition of forces testifies as never before to the ever growing social and class nature of the crisis in Lebanon and the Arab-Israeli conflict overall. This is reflected not only in the fact that during the Israeli intervention, the rightist Christian forces and the so-called Muslim fundamentalists objectively played the role of accomplices, and sometimes direct allies, of the aggressor, but also by the fact that the Arab states with conservative regimes that time actually declined to support the victims of the aggression. The "strategic union" of the forces of imperialism and Zionism were as a result not opposed by an Arab anti-Israeli coalition, as was the case in 1948, 1967 and 1973.

Under conditions of the unceasing aggression of Israel, the gross intervention of the imperialist powers in the internal affairs of Lebanon and the increasing involvement of some Muslim states, including Iran, in the Lebanese crisis, a new regrouping of political forces is taking place.

Foreign armed intervention under conditions of the unresolved civil war in Lebanon and the arrival of inter-Arab security forces in the country led by Syria, which has strong traditional ties with Lebanese Muslims, along with the appearance of a new "Iranian factor" in the Near East conflict after the sending of "Islamic volunteers" from Teheran to Lebanon that were openly on the side of the most radically inclined Shiite "fundamentalists"—all of this, under the influence of the forces and circumstances that are acting most often in diametrically opposed directions, is deepening schism both among the Christians and within all of the Muslim communities. A stratification and subsequent delimitation of forces within these communities is occurring not only on the issue of ways of resolving the Lebanese crisis itself and problems of the future state structure of Lebanon, but also on the terms for settling the broader Near East conflict, including the Palestinian problem, resistance to the American-Israeli strategic alliance in the Near East, the Iran-Iraq war and many other unresolved inter-Arab contradictions and conflicts.

The tragedy of Lebanon has become a most difficult and harsh test not only for this country, but for all Arab peoples as well. For the first time, a small Arab state has been transformed into the field of battle against Israeli and American usurpers. It has become the objective of a new "triple" aggression with the participation of the Israeli occupiers, NATO interventionists and local reactionary forces. Their undercover deal of long ago has spilled over into overt designs against the Arab liberation movement and the exploitation of state terrorism, which, sowing and multiplying violence, is driving a Near East settlement into a dead end.

Washington and Tel Aviv are making underground activity aimed at inciting intestine warfare more active in every way possible. The spinning sectarian carousel in Lebanon and the whole Muslim world alike is gathering more and more speed, threatening the sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of many Muslim countries, as well as impeding the resolution of acute social problems there on a national-democratic basis. Religious and communal traditions, as George Haul, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Lebanese Communist Party noted, are entering more and more into contradiction with national interests and the tasks of the socio-economic and political development of the country.

Such negative trends, which interfere with the consolidation of the patriotic forces of the Muslim world and divert them from the struggle in the chief directions of class and liberation battles and the resolution of the most important problems of mankind associated with eliminating the threat of nuclear war and the establishment of an all-encompassing system of international security, completely suit Washington and Tel Aviv.

The strategy and diplomacy of the United States, as of Israel, have also turned out to be in a vicious circle in the Near East. Different versions of American "peace" models, advanced by Washington to develop the "Camp

David process," have turned into new wars and bloodshed. The separate approach to the resolution of Near East problems has clearly reached a dead end. Covert acknowledgment of this undisputed fact is contained in a resolution adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1986 in which the need for the immediate convocation of an international peace conference on the Near East is affirmed. It also approves for the first time, the call of the Soviet Union to create a preparatory committee within the framework of the Security Council with the participation of all of the permanent members of the UN Security Council to take the necessary steps to convene such a conference. This step would open the way for a practical break-up of the logjam in the Near East situation through collective efforts, which the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries have been in favor of steadfastly and consistently.

The position of the USSR in relation to all regional conflicts arises from the principled and consistent policies of the Soviet Union for the liquidation of tensions in various regions of the globe with a regard for the legitimate interests of all parties and without any foreign interference whatsoever. Only thus can a solid foundation be created for the security of the Near East and the whole Afro-Asian region as an important component of an all-encompassing system of international security. Moscow also calls upon Washington to move from words to deeds. The principled consistency of peace-loving Soviet policy is opposed by the vicious continuity of aggressive concepts and the "doctrines" of Washington in all directions and in all regions of the world.

The Near East is perhaps the most sensitive nerve center of the planet. Here, as M.S. Gorbachev stressed when speaking at the international forum "For a Nuclear-Free World and the Survival of Mankind," the interests of many states are intertwined—not the Arabs and Israel alone. That is why the Soviet Union is in favor of an all-embracing and just settlement to Near East problems. For this it is essential to repudiate once and for all the use of force, seek real ways and act in concert, strictly respecting the rights of peoples to the independent choice of their path to the future.

Footnotes

1. J. Badeau. *The American Approach to the Arab World*. New York, 1968, pp 183, 184.
2. L.B. Johnson. *The Vantage Point Perspectives of the Presidency*. 1963- 1969. New York, 1971, p 293.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1987. Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

Iran, U.S. Accused of Blocking Settlement of Iran-Iraq War

18070379c Moscow AZIYA I AFRICA SFGODNYA in Russian No 6, Jun 87 pp 10-14

[Article by Candidate of Historical Sciences A. Notin under the rubric "Iraq-Iran": "What Hinders a Settlement?"]

[Excerpts] This war is called different things in the international press: a "strange war," a "war of attrition" and the like. Its distinguishing feature is seemingly emphasized in this manner: the positional nature of the military action, on the one hand, and the bet of the warring parties on the economic bleeding of the adversary, on the other.

In fact, before the recent attack near Basra, all of the successes of Iran, which in the summer of 1982 seized the initiative at the front, were limited to 36-37 square kilometers of Iraqi territory won.

The battles for Basra (December of 1986-March of 1987), however, leave no room for irony. They are undoubtedly the largest battles of recent times. About 500,000-600,000 men took part in them on each side. As early as by the end of January 1987, according to the estimates of neutral observers, Iranian losses in these battles had reached 40,000 killed and wounded, and ten thousand for Iraq.

Like the so-called "battle for the Strait of Hormuz," the combat operations around Basra show that in the last two or three years the conflict has undergone a deep transformation. Subordinate to the inexorable laws of war, it is becoming more and more cruel and bloody. The military activeness of both sides is increasing constantly. Teheran, within the framework of its strategy of waging war "to a victorious end," is appreciably increasing the pressure, going over to tactics of broad-scale operations, each of which is called upon to decide the outcome of the conflict "with a single blow." The resistance of the Iraqis, with adequate potential to repulse the enemy attacks, is growing in response.

The war is reaping an abundant harvest. The losses of Iran, which uses "human wave" tactics in offensive operations (attacks with large amounts of manpower without adequate air cover and tank and artillery support), are especially large. According to rough calculations, they comprise some 400,000-500,000 people killed and roughly the same number injured. Illegal emigration from Iran to Turkey and Pakistan has furthermore taken on a large scale. According to reports of the Turkish newspaper *MILLIYET*, by the fall of 1986 the number of refugees that had arrived in the country—largely representatives of the intelligentsia, skilled but unemployed workers and members of parties opposed to the Khomeini regime—had reached a million people. Over the six and a half years of the conflict, Iran has thus lost a total of 15-20 percent of its able-bodied male population.

The military losses of Iraq—first and foremost by virtue of the better technical equipping of the army and the waging of exclusively defensive battles for the last four years—are appreciably less. The total number of killed and wounded for the Iraqis fluctuates between 300,000 and 500,000 men. If one takes into account, however, the smaller population of Iraq (16 million people versus 45 million in Iran), the number of prisoners and deserters (about 70,000-80,000) and the scale of emigration from the country (according to estimates, up to 200,000 people, half of which are men), as well as losses in Iraqi Kurdistan, where the clashes of the regular army with Kurdish insurgents have in essence not stopped in the 1980s, it is possible to draw the conclusion that by spring of this year Iraq had lost approximately a third of its adult male population. The losses of Iraq on a relative scale are consequently higher than for Iran and its mobilization potential is close to being exhausted (according to estimates, 161,000 people reach draft age in Iraq each year, while in Iran it is 422,000).

The escalation of the conflict is leading to a sharp increase in the number of victims among the civilian populations of both countries. In recent years, the tactics of "blind" bombings and missile strikes against cities have become an indispensable component of military operations, both when they are becoming more active and when they are declining. Thus, before the mass offensive against Basra, the Iraqis, from January to November 1986, fired over five thousands shells and missiles against the city, as a result of which over 500 civilians were killed, principally women and children. Several dozen missiles—with an explosive charge of 120-150 kilograms—rained down on Baghdad in 1986. Although their target, it is assumed, is the presidential palace, not one missile hit its target. With the exception of two or three that fell into the Tigris River or unpopulated areas, the Iranian missiles exploded in thickly settled regions of the city, leading to many casualties.

Strikes against civilian targets, by the way, are carried out by both sides. By way of example, according to reports of the IRNA Agency (with references to official sources), about eight thousand people were killed and wounded and about 1,300 homes were destroyed at the height of the battles around Basra over 12 days—from 12 to 24 Jan 87—as a result of Iraqi bombings and missile salvos against Iranian cities, including Teheran.

The course of the conflict also demonstrates that the infliction of military tensions is occurring against a background (and as a result) of deepening socio-economic crisis both in Iraq and Iran. The interconnection of these aspects of the war are evident. In any case, it is namely this factor, to all appearances, that forces Khomeini to seek ways of "accelerating" victory.

If one speaks of the reasons for the sharp worsening of the economic condition of both countries, they are associated, first of all, with the decrease in the overall level of income (almost half of the prewar level) and sales

of oil and, second, the unprecedented fall of oil prices on the world market in 1986. Before the beginning of the conflict, Iran and Iraq occupied leading positions in the world in the export of oil. From the first days of the conflict, knocking oil-industry facilities out of action has been considered by the warring sides to be the shortest path to undermining the economic potential of the enemy and destabilizing his internal situation. The greatest destruction has been visited upon the oil refineries, pipelines and petrochemical-industry enterprises in the area of combat operations. Structures such as the oil-export terminals at Khor el-Amayeh and Khor el-Bakre, as well as the Port of Basra in southern Iraq, among the largest in the world, have been put out of action.

The Iraqi air force, whose effectiveness has grown appreciably in the last year, in turn bombs the refineries in Tabriz and Isfahan, Bakhtaran and Teheran. With the aid of Super-Etandard fighter-bombers equipped with Exocet missiles supplied by the French, the Iraqis have for over a year subjected the principal Iranian oil-export terminal on Kharg Island, as well as the western (in the event Kharg is out of commission) terminals on Siri and Lavan islands, located in immediate proximity to the Strait of Hormuz, to intensive bombing. The "tanker war" is also continuing: in 1986 about 90 large vessels belonging to various countries suffered the strikes of Iraqi and Iranian aviation.

If now, taking into account the aforementioned, one were to try to describe the overall situation extant in the development of the conflict by the middle of 1987, then it could be briefly described, in my opinion, by the boxing term of a "clinch," where the exhausted adversaries hang onto each other. In reality, the calculations of Baghdad of undermining the economy of the enemy via the destruction of his economic, and first and foremost oil, infrastructure have not justified themselves. The hopes of Teheran for a quick and decisive turn in the war to its favor have in turn also proven to be far from reality. The overwhelming technical superiority of the Iraqi army (6 times more tanks, 4.5 times more aircraft and 3.5 times more anti-aircraft guns) and the appreciably improved fighting spirit of the Iraqis after the war moved onto their territory have still allowed them to hold the front. At the same time, the limited nature of population resources actually deprives Iraq of the possibility of waging broad offensive operations. In short, the situation is truly at a stalemate. Its preservation in the foreseeable future portends nothing for the Iranian and Iraqi peoples other than new suffering and losses of tens and hundreds of thousands of soldiers on the field of battle.

The more ferocious the skirmishes at the front, the more apparent is the danger of this dragged-out war for the warring sides themselves and for the cause of regional and international peace. And the more insistent the necessity of its most rapid cessation. Much has been and is being done for this. The efforts made in this direction by highly regarded international organizations, including

the United Nations, the non-aligned movement, the Islamic Conference Organization (ICO) and others, as well as the governments of many countries and leading political figures, however, are not yet leading to the desired result. What are the reasons?

In order to investigate this, it is necessary first and foremost to say a few words about the views of the participants in the conflict themselves on the problem of a settlement. They are diametrically opposed.

The Iraqi leaders have declared their readiness for an immediate beginning to peace negotiations. Their concept of a settlement, and in particular that formulated in the open appeal of President S. Hussein of Iraq to the Iranian leaders (November of 1986), envisages: 1) the complete, all-embracing and unconditional withdrawal of both sides to internationally recognized borders; 2) the complete and all-encompassing exchange of prisoners of war; 3) the conclusion of a peace and non-aggression treaty between the two countries; 4) non-interference in the internal affairs of each other; and, 5) the transformation of Iraq and Iran into factors of peace and stability in the region, especially in the Persian Gulf. It also directs attention to the fact that in its current form these proposals contain no demand for the "recognition by Iran of the legal right of Iraq to the lands and waters" as first advanced in a speech of S. Hussein of 28 Sep 80 (a week after the broad-scale crossing of the border with Iran of Iraqi troops).

Notwithstanding the obvious desire of Baghdad to make concessions for the sake of peace, Khomeini has steadfastly refused to sit at the negotiating table. The official position of Teheran on the issue of settlement envisages as before the replacement of the Iraqi leadership and the payment of enormous reparations—according to various sources, from 200 to 500 billion dollars (!)—as central demands. Iran has rejected all seven resolutions of the UN General Assembly that have been adopted from 4 Jul 80 to October of 1986 that contained a call for the immediate cessation of military operations and the withdrawal of troops to internationally recognized boundaries as established by the Algiers "Treaty on Borders and Good Neighbor Relations." (2) Its representatives boycotted the debate that began in the second half of February of this year in the UN Security Council on the problem of a settlement—formally on the grounds that the Council "has still not condemned Iraq as being guilty for starting the war in 1980."

The obstructionist policies of Teheran in the UN are combined with the fomenting of military hysteria and militarist and revanchist-chauvinist sentiments in Iran itself.

Judging by several features, the policy of continuing the war "to complete victory," to the extent of rising economic difficulties and the increase in losses at the front, is causing growing dissatisfaction among ever broader segments of the Iranian population. The attitude toward

the leadership of the country, which is in fact refusing to carry out a number of progressive transformations begun in the first years of the "Islamic revolution," is changing. At the same time, opposition to Khomeini "from below" (including the adherents of peace) is growing stronger. The antiwar demonstrations that took place in 1986 in Meshed and Bakhtaran (formerly Kermanshah) numbered about five to eight thousand participants. Fearing their spread, however, the authorities smashed the demonstrations with large forces of police and detachments of "Islamic Revolutionary Guards." (3) According to some data, about a hundred people were killed and 400 wounded. Other demonstrations (for example, the physicians' strike in July and disturbances among the owners of small cafes and taxi drivers in August of last year) were only indirectly of an antiwar nature.

Under these conditions, the fate of the conflict evidently depends chiefly on the rulers of Iran, who are far from unified in their evaluations of many phenomena, and a struggle is underway among them, as testified to in particular by the recent arrests of about a hundred adherents of the Ayatollah Montazeri, the official successor of Khomeini. This struggle, however, has not yet been reflected in the official positions of Teheran in regard to the problems of a settlement. In my opinion, this is explained first and foremost by the fact that the most reactionary circles of the Iranian clergy consider the conflict to be a means of reinforcing their power. The war with Iraq has permitted them in the 1980s not only to weaken the political opposition, but also to eliminate such potential adversaries of the regime as the army (more precisely, the remnants of the officer corps that, as is well known, were against the "Islamic revolution") from participation in public life. A definite restraining influence on the development of the settlement process is apparently causing Iran many losses in the war: in striving to realize their military and strategic advantage of recent years, the ruling circles of the country want to "justify" the casualties they have suffered in the eyes of the people.

Also among the factors that are hindering a break-up of the logjam in the Iran-Iraq conflict are also the contractions that it has evoked over time. Some of them have retained their sharpness today. They are the traditional rivalry of the two countries in the Persian Gulf region and territorial and border disputes. Differences of opinion in the ideological realm engendered by Teheran's policy of "exporting Islamic revolution," it seems, have lost their initial heat somewhat, since neither one side nor the other has been ultimately able to "split the internal front of the enemy," inciting religious discord.

The continuation of the Iran-Iraq conflict is caused by external factors as well as internal ones. There is no doubt of this today. The imperialists of the United States, the NATO countries and their allies in the Near East have a vested interest in "conserving" the seat of war in the region, which Western strategists call the "southern underbelly of the USSR," for as long a period

as possible. The scandal connected with Irangate has made it possible to reveal somewhat the mechanism, for this policy, "unprincipled" in the term of the WASHINGTON POST, of the Reagan administration. Its essence is not so much the conclusion of secret deals with the knowledge and at the initiative of the White House for the sale of American arms to the Khomeini regime, the publicly declared "enemy of America," as it is the rendering of direct military assistance to both participants in the conflict for the purpose of making it crueler in nature. Much is known today of the ties of the United States with Iran. Here is what the newspaper HINDUSTAN TIMES writes about the flip side of Irangate—the American aid to Iraq: "Aside from deliveries of weapons and the granting of credit of 500 million dollars through the Export-Import Bank, Washington supplies Iraq with military reconnaissance data collected by its satellites and AWACS spy planes on a considerable scale."

The strategic goals of the double game of the U.S. administration, undertaken to the detriment of the true interests of the peoples of Iran and Iraq, are understandable. Escalation permits a steady increase in the American military and political presence in the Persian Gulf region. The foundations have already been laid. (4) But the Pentagon, judging by the latest reports, does not intend to dwell on what has been achieved. In January of 1987, plans became known to transfer another six American divisions and 600 combat aircraft that are based in Europe to the region. An order to set a course for the Strait of Hormuz was received by the aircraft carrier John F. Kennedy, accompanied by missile destroyer-escorts. Several squadrons of F-16 aircraft were also transferred to Turkey. Such are the "military dividends" obtained by the United States after the attack of Iran on Basra.

Moreover, the utmost prolongation of the Iran-Iraq conflict has another important political meaning for the United States and its "strategic ally"—Israel. The war diverts enormous human and financial resources of the Arab world that could be directed to the fight against Israeli expansionism. The schism among the Arab countries is growing deeper due to the failure of their positions to coincide with regard to the conflict, and especially due to the support rendered to Iran by Syria and Libya. The attention of the international community to the central issues of a Near East settlement, and first and foremost the Palestinian problem, is weakening. In this climate, the realization of the imperial plans of the "strategic alliance" of the United States and Israel in the Near East is made substantially easier. It is no accident that as early as 1982 one of the highly placed Israeli military declared in the newspaper EDIOT AKHRO-NOT with candid cynicism: "We view with satisfaction the determination with which these two countries are destroying each other."

In the Soviet Union we understand what a serious and real threat to Iran and Iraq and the security and stability

of the neighboring states of the Persian Gulf and international peace overall is created by this conflict. Over the six and a half years of its development, the USSR has energetically and consistently sought political ways for resolving the differences between Iran and Iraq. The latest important step in this direction was taken in the course of the negotiations of Soviet leaders with the foreign ministers of Iran and Iraq held in Moscow in February of 1987. It was emphasized therein—and this is the essence of the USSR position—that the warring countries have no insurmountable differences and that only imperialist forces for whom this war is profitable would gain from a continuation of the conflict; the sooner the sides sit down at the negotiating table, the better it will be for both Iran and Iraq, as well as for the cause of peace in the Near East.

Footnotes

2. For more detail on the Algiers Treaty of 1975, as well as the mutual territorial claims of Iran and Iraq, see: D. Kasatkin, V. Ushakov, "Iran—Iraq. The Fourth Year of War..." *AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA*, 1984, No 3, p 7.

3. The "Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps" (IRGC) is a massive militarized organization created in Iran after the revolution of 1979. According to estimates, its ranks include 300,000 people. IRGC subunits constantly take part in military operations. In Iraq, along with units of the regular army, there are detachments of the Baath Party People's Army on all sectors of the front—northern, central and southern. In 1982 it numbered some 120,000 people (according to a resolution of the 9th Baath Regional Congress, the People's Army should have grown to 500,000 people by 1985).

4. As early as 1985, under the pretext of "ensuring navigational safety" in the Strait of Hormuz, the United States and the NATO countries concentrated an enormous military potential in the region. There are five U.S. Navy cruisers here permanently under headed by the flagship *Lasalle*. The carrier *Midway* plies the shores of Oman with 85 combat aircraft on board, supported by six other ships; another U.S. 30 ships could arrive here at any moment from the Indian Ocean. The Persian Gulf is furthermore considered to be "Objective No 1" for the 250,000-man contingent of the U.S. "Rapid Deployment Forces" that are maintained at 48-hour readiness. Considerable naval forces are also maintained here by Great Britain and France.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1987. Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

12821

Commentary on Fabius Plan for Franco-FRG Integration

18070402a Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Aug 87 p 3

[Article by V. Bolshakov, Paris, August: "What is the 'Alliance According to Fabius?': On the Question of French-West German Unification"]

[Text] Laurent Fabius, the former French Prime Minister, one of the prominent leaders of the French Socialist Party, and an individual close to President Mitterrand, is the author of a recent article in the magazine *LE MONDE* entitled, "For Franco-German Unification."

The theme of his sensational article is not a new one and the arguments in support of Franco-FRG economic, military and political integration are also not new. The idea of a Franco-FRG alliance, under the aegis of France, of course, developed long ago in the depths of the ruling class. Moreover, this is a type of programme for the future candidate of the socialist party in the 1988 presidential election. Right now Michel Rocard has put himself into the running for this position without the official sanction of the party. However, it has not been ruled out that closer to March Fabius will join the fight.

Thus, let us discuss integration with the FRG. Why does France need it? Fabius poses the problem in the following manner. During the 21st century France will no longer be able to contend with the great powers—China, the U.S.A. and the USSR. For this reason it is essential to take steps already now toward unifying the FRG and France, if not all of Western Europe. V. Giscard-D'Estaing, the former president of France, has presented the thesis that Europe means a chance for France. According to Fabius an alliance between the FRG and France can become the first step in the creation of a "unified Europe," i.e. in the complete integration of Common Market countries—a single parliament, single citizenship, a single currency, joint armed forces as well as unification in other areas.

Laurent Fabius is a student of the economic school which fashions France's economy and foreign economic ties in favor of the country's large capital interests. It is no accident that while still in the government of the socialists he was working out a strategy of denationalization which was later approved only by right-wing parties. His hope for the economic integration of France and the FRG is based on long-range plans for French capital interests, which are no longer satisfied with a narrow national framework. His article discusses the creation of a "central European bank," and a type of currency-financial center with extensive powers, which with the existence of a single European currency will bring an end to "all attempts to give rise to protectionism in European countries by means of the manipulation of the exchange rate for currency." In his opinion the creation of this type of bank is impossible without a preliminary agreement between France and the FRG, which has the strongest currency in the Common Market.

This type of alliance could withstand the onslaught of Italian, Belgian, Spanish and Dutch financial-industrial groups which have recently become strong. England should also participate more closely. The intent here is international—having strengthened each other, these countries can then mount an offensive against the still all-powerful but already weakening dollar and against the growing muscle of the yen.

It is not difficult to imagine what the economic consequences of the French-West German alliance will be for French workers. Capitalist improvements in production methods being carried out in a number of branches already today are resulting in the layoff of thousands upon thousands of workers and employees. The experience of the post-war years has shown that West German monopolies demonstrate greater economic power than French monopolies, and for this reason the continued "bringing up" of French industry to the level of the FRG's economy may have the same ending as that of the meeting between the cast iron pot and the clay pot, as A. Lajoinie, communist presidential candidate, descriptively stated. In his words, advantages will be reaped from this large capital in both countries, but "the little man will have to pay at this fool's market."

Acrid assessments of the future of a West German economic merger with France still sound mellow in comparison with the criticism which is being levelled at a military alliance between the two countries. But plans are underway to unify their defenses and to provide Bonn with Paris' "nuclear umbrella." In his article in *LE MONDE*, Fabius systematically puts forth the interests of France's military-industrial complex, which has gained strength during the last decade and which has brought the country into the international market in the arms trade.

The French MIC [military-industrial complex] has long been striving for hegemony in the European arms market and supposes that with the aid of the West German military industry it will be easier to achieve this goal. This kind of cooperation will probably not be limited to the production of a "Franco-FRG helicopter" publicized by Fabius. The author of the *LE MONDE* article is looking further. But alas, he is looking through the very same glasses as the current cabinet of right-wing parties. In essence his idea is the well-known "European charter," within the framework of which J. Chirac proposed to implement the military integration of Western Europe's countries under the aegis of the West European union. Like the right-wing, socialist Fabius supports the creation of a joint Franco-FRG military formation—the prototype for future united armed forces of the two countries and the foundation for the "organization of a military Europe." He also does not exclude the fact that France's nuclear power can at any given moment be utilized to "protect" the FRG.

We can ask him, as we ask the right wing, "why now, when the USSR has proposed far-reaching proposals which could move the matter of military disarmament in

Europe forward as never before and which could free Europe of the dangerous fate promised by a store of nuclear weapons and by the nuclear theater of military actions," has Laurent Fabius, as stated in an article in the newspaper *HUMANITE*, decided "to appeal to those who feel nostalgia for super arms and to fight for the distribution of French containment forces to Kohl's Germany?"

Fabius evidently understands that similar recommendations, do not sound appropriate for the times. Being powerless to ignore Soviet peace initiatives and to come forward against them, in contrast to the rightwing, he proposes a specific program of mini-disarmament with French participation, but only in that which involves its so-called supplementary strategic arms (short-range nuclear missiles, chemical warfare agents).

In his opinion, France may join the disarmament process, but only after the following is implemented: "the double zero variant," a curtailment of the strategic arsenal of the USSR and U.S.A., the elimination of chemical weapons, and after the existing, in his opinion, imbalance within the sphere of regular arms is decreased to a minimum. After this we will be able to begin to decrease the number of short-range nuclear weapons, including French, with total elimination planned for the future.

However, within this "consistency" there are many hidden traps. Together with the right wing and the socialists in the French parliament, L. Fabius voted to accept the arms program developed by J. Chirac's cabinet, which spans 5 years and which foresees the production of chemical (binary) warfare agents, the neutron bomb, short-range missiles with nuclear warheads and so forth. It was passed and is being implemented at a rapid pace. And Fabius is not diverging from it in his "disarmament program." What does the "twofold approach" consist of? Here is the answer to that question. When the USSR and U.S.A. were close to a solution to the question of eliminating chemical warfare agents, France began to produce them. The same was true of French short-range nuclear missiles. So what is it that Fabius supports? Disarmament or the arms race under the banner of a "united Europe," the first step of which will be an alliance between the FRG and France? And what will be the consequence of this step? Will it be the substitution of French warheads for American nuclear warheads for 72 West German Pershing-1A's?

We could continue the list of such questions. Fabius' appearance in *LE MONDE* has put many on guard. In it they saw not only another confirmation of the acute swing to the right of the leadership of the socialist party, not only proof of the erosion of the boundaries between today's right wing and yesterday's left wing but also an evident striving of the French ruling class to utilize French nuclear arms to provide themselves with commanding positions in the future "unified Europe." The

fact that in the FRG France's "nuclear contribution" is understood to be an indispensable condition for the proposed alliance is no longer a secret from anyone.

Of all French political parties only the French Communist Party now supports a curtailment of the arms race and the elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000. In this communists diverge completely not only from the right wing but also from the leadership of the socialists, which in and of itself already makes it impossible to have a union of leftist forces, a factor which contributed to their success during the 1981 elections. Fabius' article in LE MONDE again confirms the correctness of the conclusion that in all principle questions of French foreign and domestic policy the leaders of socialist parties now stand much closer to the right wing than to their former allies—communists in the leftist block. This results in a weakening of the socialist party and of leftist forces in general.

8228

**Articles Not Translated in AZIYA I AFRIKA
SEGODNYA No 6, 1987**
*180°03'9" Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA
in Russian No 6, Jun 8 p 1*

P. Shastitko, A. Kovalevskiy. The Dynamics of Development 2

A. Notin. Iraq—Iran. What Hinders a Settlement? 10

Chandrajit Yadav. "We Admired Lenin..." 20

Vassos Lissaridis. For Peace and Security in the Mediterranean ... 22

B. Kozlov. Vietnam. Yesterday and Today "Sikoviny fong fu" 23

K. Vladimirov, M. Isinaliyev. Mauritius. Meetings on the Sunny Island 26

Suleiman Kaddakh: "The Great Dream of Mankind is Being Realized" 28

EVENTS... FACTS... FIGURES... 34

Ye. Buzni. The City Without Which There Is No India 42

V. Korochantsev. Sub-Saharan Africa. Tell Me What House You Live in... 45

I. Kechin. The Arrivals From Indostan 48

N. Vysotskaya. The Soviet-Congolese Colloquium 50

A. Bogdanov. The Art of the Arab World: Traditions and Modern Times 51

Abd al-Karim Gallyab (Morocco). Right up to Failure. Chapter from a Novel 55

N. Krasnodembskaya. Sri Lanka. Sinhalese: Environment, Habitation, Housing, Customs 58

V. Yevgenyev. North Africa. Tea or Coffee for You? 60

THE WORLD OF BOOKS: Traditional Powers in Uganda [Review of Book by A. S. Balezin] 62

12821

**Indian Author's Book on Sikh Separatism
Reviewed**

*180°03'9" Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA
in Russian No 6, Jun 87 pp 62-63*

[Review "Sikh Separatism in India" by Candidate of Historical Sciences V. Kashin of book "Sikh Separatism: the Politics of Faith" by R.A. Kapur. London, 1986, 272 pp]

[Text] One of the most acute problems in the socio-political life of contemporary India is the strengthening of separatism and regionalism, which pose a serious threat to the national unity and territorial integrity of the country. The evolution of Sikh separatism is the chief topic of the research of UN staff member R.A. Kapur. The book has been written on the basis of a wide circle of sources, including archives in India.

The author traces in detail the process of the formation of Sikh political organizations, and first and foremost the Akali Dal Party (literally the "Party of the Immortals"). Created in the middle of the 1920s by Sikh reformers that were opposed to the Hindu religious community, the party declared itself to be the expressor of common Sikh interests.

As the author justly emphasizes, the policies of the British colonial authorities played a large role in the formation of Sikh separatism. Skillfully inflaming religious and communal contradictions, the colonizers supported the notion that the Sikhs are an independent nation. When Mahatma Gandhi declared the beginning of the civil disobedience campaign of 1930-31, the leaders of the Sikh community decided not to participate in the national-liberation struggle on the grounds that the symbolic color of the Sikhs was missing on the flag of the Indian National Congress. The separatist ambitions of the Akali Dal leadership were especially reinforced in the middle of the 1940s in the climate of preparing for and implementing the partition of India into the Indian Union and Pakistan. The partition of India according to religious principles entailed the dismemberment of Punjab, where a large portion of the Sikhs traditionally resided. Under these conditions, the leader of Akali Dal, Tara Singh, advanced the idea of the creation of a

separate Sikh state of Sikhistan (literally "land of the Sikhs") or Khalistan (literally "land of the pure") in Punjab. This idea received the all-round support of the colonial administration.

After the proclamation of the independence of India, Sikh separatism, in the opinion of the author, passed through two stages. The principal demand of Akali Dal in the first stage (1947-66) was the creation of a state with a Sikh majority on a national-linguistic basis. In 1966, Hindi-speaking Haryana was split off from Punjab, and the Sikhs, whose native language is Punjabi, comprised 54 percent of the state's population.

In the contemporary stage, the leaders of Akali Dal have advanced a demand to grant Punjab "broad autonomy," including an expansion of the administrative borders of the state. Over the course of 1981-84, the party carried out several campaigns of civil disobedience in support of the demands that it had advanced in negotiations with the central government. This movement included broad masses of the Sikh population. At the same time, elements of the Sikh and student body youth inclined toward extremism carried out a series of terrorist attacks under the motto of the creation of "Khalistan" based on Punjab. Among their victims were Sikh employees of state institutions and police officials loyal to the central government along with the civilian population, including many women and children.

The ruling circles of Pakistan along with Western intelligence agencies, trying to dismember India and in that manner weaken its constructive role in the international arena, are rendering broad support to the Sikh terrorists. The book exposes the true nature of a whole series of political events in India: Operation Blue Star to clean the Golden Temple in Amritsar from the extremists that had occupied it, the assassination of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi of India, the removal by extremists of Akali Dal chairman H.S. Longowal, the memorandum signed with the government of Rajiv Gandhi aimed at restoring peace and tranquillity in Punjab, and others.

The quite topical book of R.A. Kapur facilitates a deeper understanding of the political processes that have transpired in India in recent years. In researching the essence and evolution of Sikh separatism, the author was unable to avoid some unilateral evaluations. Thus, the economic roots of the communal contradictions in Punjab, in whose economy there has historically existed a division into Hindu industrialists and Sikh peasants, were not revealed. The problem of the socio-economic and political heterogeneity within the Sikh community itself was not uncovered. The author moreover notes frequently that the majority of the Sikhs condemn terrorism. The activity of the underground organizations of Sikh extremists abroad, directly linked to many acts of violence and terror on Indian territory and outside its borders, was also beyond the field of view of the author.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1987. Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

12821

'Islamic Renewal', Decline of Secularism in Turkey Assailed

18070379g Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA in Russian No 6, Jun 87 pp 38-40

[Article by A. Stepanov: "Layism under Threat?"]

[Text] The figures of women wrapped in black veils are today perceived as an ordinary phenomenon on the streets of Istanbul, Ankara and other Turkish cities. As recently as 10-15 years ago, however, they evoked surprise. The black veils, that symbol of the orthodox Muslim, having become a distinctive fashion, have also appeared at Turkish universities. Bearded youth are filling hundreds of religious schools, indispensable rosaries in their hands—a sign of piety and devotion. In Turkish higher educational institutions, there are about 20,000 future schoolteachers today, and courses in studying the Koran and preparing imams are attended by almost 300,000 people. The aggregate circulation of religious periodical literature approaches a half a million, and some 600,000 copies of the Koran are sold in the country each year. Never before in the history of the Turkish Republic have so many mosques been built, but on Fridays they still cannot accommodate all of those praying.

These are some purely outward manifestations of the "resurrection of Islam" in the country, where the principles of secularism—the separation of church and state—and layism—secular civil authority—were fixed in the constitution at the initiative of the founder of the Turkish Republic, Kemal Ataturk, as early as 1928. The incarnation of these principles then encountered fierce resistance on the part of the proponents of religious rule, based on the support of the Ottoman bureaucracy and the religious and feudal-landholding classes. Matters came to an open revolt against government authority. Thanks to decisive measures by K. Ataturk, however, the anti-government demonstrations of the backward segments of the population headed by the clergy and the Dervish orders (actually religious sects) were successfully eliminated.

In the period following the Second World War, the rival bourgeois parties chasing the votes of the religiously inclined segments of the population—the peasantry, tradesmen, craftsmen and parts of the working class—appealed more and more to Islam, and especially to traditional Muslim legislation—Shariat. Layism gradually began to give way. In the 1960s and 1970s, outbursts against the secular legacy of K. Ataturk and for the restoration of Shariat occurred in various regions of the

country. As especially powerful burst of religious extremism occurred in 1978 in the city of Kahramanmaraş, where over a hundred people perished as a result of over three days of disorder.

After the military coup of 1980, all political parties and religious-extremist organizations were banned. In the last several years, however, under conditions of the gradual restoration of bourgeois-democratic norms, the religious "fundamentalism" movement once again came to the surface. The constitution of 1982 reserves a special place for Islam in the life of the country. Religiously inclined figures came into many key posts both in the state apparatus and in the system of education. Compulsory religious education was restored in the schools. A certain well-known Turkish teacher told me: "Imagine my difficulty when I explain to third graders the circulation of water in nature, and the next day the mullah asserts that Allah sends rain to the Earth." The influence of Islam has also gotten stronger in the realm of culture, and various sects operating illegally along with Dervish orders have become more active. Thus, the extremely influential sect "Nurju" propagates the idea of the restoration of Shariat norms in the state and private life of Muslims along with the idea of modernism. And this teaching strikes a responsive chord among believers.

The recent publication of articles in the Turkish press, especially in the newspapers *MILLİYET* and *HÜRRIYET*, in which the danger of "reactionary movements and underground organizations" was pointed out, had the effect of setting off a bomb. Their total number has supposedly reached a million people and continues to grow literally with each passing day. Among these organizations are cited such sects as the Nakshbandiye order and the aforementioned Nurju, as well as Halidiyye, Suleimaniye and a number of others that have, as the Turkish newspapers noted, ties with foreign ones as well. The most dangerous of them, in the opinion of the Turkish press, is Nakshbandiye, which has played an active role in all of the anti-republic demonstrations and considers armed struggle one of the chief means of advancing their goals. Even the president of the republic, K. Evren, directed attention in a public speech to the danger of religious extremism and dangerous prejudices.

What is the reason for the "resurrection of Islam"? The representatives of Turkish democratic society feel that in a country where the overwhelming majority of the population are Muslims, bourgeois parties have played and will continue to play on religious feelings to attract votes. Furthermore, in cultivating Muslim world views and traditions and "absorbing" the shock wave of the "resurrection of Islam," the ruling circles see a reliable means of counteracting the dissemination of progressive democratic convictions, and first and foremost scientific socialism.

In recent years the government of T. Ozal has conducted an economic policy of "liberalization," or "open doors," in which emphasis is placed on attracting foreign capital

and technology, the preferential development of the private sector to the detriment of the state one, sharp incentives for exports and the subsequent integration of the national mechanism of economic operation into the international capitalist market.

Orientation of Turkish exports and imports toward the Muslim countries occupies an especial place in this policy. Turkey buys liquid fuels from the oil-producing states of the Near and Middle East and delivers its agricultural and industrial output there. More than a third of Turkish foreign trade goes to the Muslim world. The activity of Turkish contract-construction companies has expanded broadly in the oil-producing countries, and the total value of Turkish contracts there exceeds 20 billion dollars. Acting out of economic interests, Turkey is trying to make maximum use of the foreign economic "Islamic factor." It is actively striving to appear as a brother Muslim country, with which it is simpler, more reliable and, more profitably, quicker to establish economic relations, in the Muslim world and in its regional organizations. The affiliation of Turkey with the Muslim world, its belief in the spiritual values and cultural and historical traditions of Islam and concern for the preservation and enhancement of the Muslim legacy are all being demonstrated in every way possible both within the country itself and outside it. All of this is considered a sort of "pass" into the markets of the Muslim countries.

On the other hand, the "resurrection of Islam" has recently begun to take on a form unacceptable to the authorities. This was facilitated by a number of factors, especially the social consequences of the policy of "liberalization." Having sharply curtailed the protectionist role of the state, it accelerated the erosion of the petty-bourgeois segments in the village and the city, leading to an increase in socio-economic differentiation and the polarization of rich and poor. In the last six or seven years alone, the rural population has declined by almost 10 percent. Quitting the villages in search of work and a piece of bread, the peasants, along with ruined craftsmen and small tradesmen, are settling in "poverty belts" encircling Turkish cities, in the "gegekondur" regions, that is, squalid huts built overnight and devoid of the barest amenities. According to some data, some 60-70 percent of the urban population now lives in them. The former rural landowner-laborers are supplemented by an almost four-million-strong army of unemployed and are really being turned into lumpen-proletariat. They seek support in religious views, in unity with the same victims of misfortune—easing their poverty-stricken condition—and in Muslim concepts of social justice—the solution of their problems.

The domination of Western, and first and foremost American, "mass culture" with its cult of sex and violence further profoundly offends the feelings of the believers, contradicts their ethical norms and insults their dignity. A turn to the "glorious Muslim past," an excruciating search for originality, the idealization of the

patriarchal nature of religion and the rejection of Western styles of dress, behavior and living are all a reaction to the spiritual emptiness of the imported "mass media," the introduction of a spirit of grasping and mindless consumption and moral decay that has grown stronger under the influence of poverty and lawlessness. The most extreme expression of this trend is the total rejection of everything Western, the idea of the resurrection of the Caliphate or the establishment of an Islamic republic according to the Iranian model.

Religious extremism as a product of the unhealthy break of the traditional segments of society under the intrigues of major capital and as a specific form of social protest is not a new phenomenon for the Muslim countries of the Near and Middle East. It has not stood idly by in Turkey as well.

The democratic circles of the country, coming forth in defense of Kemalist principles of secularism and layism, see a solution to the acute social problems, uniquely refracted through the prism of Islam, in the elimination of any limitations on political freedoms in contemporary Turkey, the establishment of genuine democracy, the ascent of national culture and the assurance of the vital needs of the Turkish workers.

COPYRIGHT "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1987. Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

12821

'Neofascism' of Afrikaaner Resistance Movement Assailed

IND 03/91 Moscow. IZD I I AFRIKA SEGODNY I
in Russian No 6, Jun 87 pp 30-33

[Article by V. Molev under the rubric "Against Apartheid and Racism": "South Africa—The Storm Troopers of Neofascism"]

[Text] Hardly anyone took them seriously until recently. Several times a year, on holidays, they appeared on the streets of Pretoria, dressed in old-fashioned uniforms of the "great trek"—the mass resettlement of the Boers, or Afrikaaners, to the north of South Africa. The women in long, severe skirts and starched bonnets. The men in coarsely made leather jackets, trousers of homespun wool and wide-brimmed hats. Pacing decorously to the memorial to the first white colonists, they waved small flags of the old Boer republics of Transvaal and the Orange Free State. Nostalgia for the remote past, when the Boers were the fully empowered masters of this country? Looking at them, people with a bewildered smile shrugged their shoulders and went about their business.

In South Africa today, they not only know them—they speak of them a lot, and most often without a hint of a smile. Not because their leader and spiritual mentor

43-year-old farmer Eugene Terreblanche, is more similar in his mannerisms to an unbridled SS storm trooper than a good-natured bourgeois. And not even because onto the flags of the Boer republics today has crept a red and white panel with three "sevens or axes" joined at the base, exceedingly reminiscent of a swastika, the fascist youth have long been based in the country of apartheid. Many are alarmed by the freedom of actions that this neofascist organization—the Afrikaaner Resistance Movement (ARM)—enjoys. Even the police in the capital granted them a hall for a gathering in which thousands of adherents of the ARM took part.

Petersburg, a small city in the Transvaal, has traditionally served as a stronghold of the open adherents of racial segregation. On its tidy streets, in Dutch Reformed churches with spires straining upward, in the private residences of the white suburbs—literally everywhere hovered a spirit of solid belief in the permanent nature of the apartheid regime. Here the ruling Nationalist Party has unfailingly enjoyed the full support of the white minority. It was namely here at the end of May 1986 that the Afrikaaner Resistance Movement first declared itself a real political force. The Nationalist Party had planned to hold a meeting whose chief speaker was to be Minister of Foreign Affairs Roelof Botha. He was selected by E. Terreblanche as the main target of his attack, vowing that he would not speak in Petersburg. R. Botha, who has won a reputation as a man of pugnacious nature, in turn swore that he would speak there.

On the day of the meeting, about a thousand adherents of the ARM blockaded the building where the Nationalists were meeting. Next they penetrated into the hall, seized the rostrum and, cracking whips, chairs and even tables, shattered everything, forcing the public to withdraw in disgrace. For two hours the exultant members of the ARM howled, stamped about and shouted insults directed at R. Botha.

The bold sortie of the ARM against the Nationalist Party was an open display of the profound differences of opinion that had arisen in the white community because of the "reformist" policies of President Piter Botha. Dissatisfaction with his policies among the extreme right has been maturing for a long time. In the same town of Petersburg, as early as 1982, the Conservative Party challenged the Nationalists, winning a majority of the key posts in the city and representative seats from this region in parliament and the provincial council. The preference of the white residents for the Conservative Party is quite easily explained: it expressed alarm for their privileges, which were, they felt, threatened by the reforms of P. Botha. The development of a new constitution that envisaged the creation of a three-chamber parliament and the granting of the right to vote to people of "colored" and Asian extraction, even the discussion of which was earlier banned, had begun at that time at his initiative. The participation of the "coloreds" and Asians in affairs of state, however, would remain purely nominal: practically all control over parliament was

retained in the hands of the white minority. And the main thing—the black-skinned Africans, comprising some 73 percent of the population of South Africa, were excluded from political life as before.

The decision of P. Botha to enter onto the path of constitutional reforms was forced. His actions under conditions of growing confrontation between the apartheid regime and the oppressed majority were dictated by a clear desire to split the forces of the national-liberation movement and reinforce the power of the racists. Some of the white community, however, sounded the alarm. When in March of 1986 he announced—under the pressure of all these circumstances—the formal abrogation of a number of fundamental laws of apartheid, including the pass laws that made it possible to monitor the movements of the Africans, the dissatisfaction of the ultra-rightists knew no bounds. They accused the government and the Nationalist Party of "betraying the interests of the white man." At this moment, the ARM selected R. Botha—one of the most visible propagandists of reformist tactics—as the target for their attack.

The Afrikaaner Resistance Movement (in Afrikaans—the "Afrikaaner Weerstandsbeweging") was created in 1973. A group of white workers, alarmed by the inability of the authorities to preserve the system of apartheid in unaltered form, vowed to lay down their lives for the sake of affirming the authoritarian regime, unswervingly observing segregation by race. This is the "people's Boer state"—Boervolkstaat—and a homeland of white rule, where Africans would be eternally deprived of all rights, that was proposed for creation on the territory of the provinces of Transvaal, Orange and part of Natal, once part of the Boer republics.

The program of the ARM, according to reports in the South African newspaper SUNDAY TIMES, also envisages the liquidation of all opposition political parties, the granting of the right to vote to whites alone, and the transfer of all power to a supreme organ—the Opper-raad—whose members would only be Afrikaaners. The ARM included opposition parties, liberal student and women's organizations, the Institute of Race Relations and the South African Council of Churches, which was against racial discrimination, on their blacklist. As was acknowledged as early as then by a member of parliament from the Nationalist Party, today the deputy minister of information, L. J. S. Nel, the ARM is an overtly extremist organization, ready to annihilate anyone who is not a pure-blooded Afrikaaner. But right up until 1979, when ARM youth caused a racist pogrom at the University of Pretoria, practically nothing was known of it. Relegated to oblivion, however, its leaders were not twiddling their thumbs.

Today the ARM has been transformed into a large group of fanatical racists in a mobile militarized organization that numbers about 100,000 members. Their number includes personnel functionaries and the fighters of its military wing called "Senedel," consisting of operational

"formations" of "Blitz-Kommandos" and a detachment of motorcyclists called "Falcon-Storm Troopers." Outfitted in black or khaki uniforms, with pistols, these fighters protect the leaders of the ARM, maintain "order" in their private neighborhoods and, naturally, shatter those they feel are their adversaries.

The alarming—almost triple—growth in the ARM over the last year is a direct result of the acute socio-political and economic crisis that the country is suffering. This is the answer of the most conservative groups of the white minority in South Africa, reacting heatedly to the inability of the government to suppress the mass demonstrations of the African population that have not been quelled since the Soweto uprising of 1976 and are demanding the immediate elimination of apartheid. A prolonged decline in the economy has been observed, while the anti-racist disturbances constantly flaring up here and there inflict even more harm on it. Production is declining and inflation and prices are going up. The exchange rate of the rand has fallen from 1.35 dollars to 35 cents. The number of bankruptcies has increased, the standard of living has fallen and unemployment among the whites is growing—some 188,000 white urbanites are looking for work compared to 105,000 in the middle of 1985.

"We have always had a certain number of whites that are suffering financial difficulties. But today the situation is becoming very bad," admitted Leon de Koker, a priest in the Dutch Reformed Church, who since the beginning of 1985 has organized the distribution of free breakfasts in the Johannesburg suburb of Jan-Hofmeier, a depressed region with state homes for whites. And this is not an isolated instance. As Associated Press correspondent Maureen Johnson reports, for the first time since the 1930s the children of the workers in the white suburbs are standing in line for a free bowl of soup.

The overwhelming majority of white South Africans is ready to defend the system of racial segregation, and the worsening economic situation only strengthens their resolve in this. (1) "Apartheid is the most just and most correct principle on Earth, because it is the only means for the co-existence of two opposing cultures without frictions and conflicts," asserts E. Terreblanche, expressing the point of view of these segments. It matters not to them that the black majority thinks completely otherwise. "We had the land," says South African bishop Desmond Tutu figuratively. "The whites came with their Bible and said to us: 'Close your eyes and pray.' When we opened our eyes, they had taken the land, and we were left with the Bible."

Yes, the prosperity of the racist minority is built on robbery. It is namely the cheap manpower of the Africans under apartheid that has provided the white community in South Africa, taken as a whole, with one of the highest standards of living on Earth. Naturally, quite a few of the rich whites fear that even the tiny reforms that the government of P. Botha was forced to advance under

pressure from the oppressed masses will threaten their privileged status. The whites with low incomes were also seized with acute uncertainty. Apartheid had earlier guaranteed protection for the poorly skilled workers of European extraction from competition with blacks in the labor market. Farmers are tormented by the idea that they will have to share the land, or else even lose it altogether. After all, some 87 percent of the territory of South Africa is fixed as for the whites, and the rest is for the 26 million Africans.

"Fear is at the core of all of the thoughts and actions of the whites in South Africa," declared William Klein-hans, an Afrikaaner and dean of the Political Science Department at the University of South Africa, formerly a member of the extreme right "true" Nationalist Party. "They are afraid that the African majority will swallow them up, that the blacks will oppress the whites the same way that the whites have oppressed them all these years. And they should be afraid. They think that they will be able to retain power for themselves, and thus they behave cruelly, stupidly and shortsightedly."

These farmers, scared to death, the poorly skilled workers, the petty officials, the impoverished bourgeois, the unemployed, the lumpen-proletariat—this is the abundant environment that nourishes the brown plague in South Africa today. Seeing with horror how the government is conceding, in their opinion, to the challenge of the "despicable keffirs," they dream of finding a bulwark, support, protection. And then E. Terreblanche shouts from the rostrum: "We are the reality of Africa, we will remain in Africa and we alone will rule the land of our fathers. The Lord is on our side!" and their hearts are filled with hope once again.

An outstanding orator, Terreblanche deftly plays on the religious feelings of the Afrikaaners. "White South Africa," he assures them, calling to mind the racist ravings of Hitler, "is threatened by the Antichrist—European capitalists." It is they, he says, that "have seized the natural wealth of our country and are pushing Botha and the Nationalist Party to transfer power to the African majority."

Such conjectures, spiced with mystical rhetoric, could be directly included among fantasies if they did not have a clear social thrust and did not express the essence of the interests of the Afrikaaner petty landowners. The blow is actually aimed against large monopoly capital, whose representatives until comparatively recently had belonged exclusively to the English-speaking portion of white society. They controlled the leading sectors of the economy of South Africa, and it was namely in their midst that the "heretical" view of doing away with the system of apartheid was first expressed from individuals in the ruling class, since it was becoming a bigger and bigger drag on the economic development of the country. Coming forward with this idea in particular was the widely known "Diamond Harry"—the South African industrial magnate of European nationality named

Harry Oppenheimer. "New" large entrepreneurs from among the Afrikaaners, for whom profits are dearer than the political doctrine of apartheid, have since joined with him.

"The businessmen want economic interests to be ultimately higher than political logic," declared Michael Spayser, an employee of the gigantic Anglo-American Mining Company. This means, aside from everything else, that instead of a compulsory decentralization of facilities—the movement of plants in the "homelands" to the periphery, where the manpower has been displaced—must be resolved by the Africans working freely in the cities, where the industrial enterprises would be most sensibly located from an economic point of view. This in turn assumes the abrogation or substantial reconsideration of the two most important legal institutions of apartheid—the pass laws and the law that strictly limits the territories where various groups can reside. And these steps undoubtedly clash with the interests of the small Afrikaaner landowners.

As for the "new" Afrikaaner capitalists, they have concluded an agreement with the business community of South Africa, where Britishers (emigres from Great Britain) predominate, with whom the Afrikaaner ruling class is united by bank accounts, not by ethnic commonality. For the sake of this union, they have stood aside from their brothers—the farmers—who have traditionally adhered to extremely conservative and rightist views.

"We fought for this country and paid for it with our blood. It belongs to us... We are not afraid, we are ready not only to fight, but to die for it!" E. Terreblanche calls them to battle under his banner, the new Fuehrer of the "chosen people." And stung by the vital apostasy of the Afrikaaner higher-ups, filled with fear before the threat of the ruin of their accustomed mores, saturated with the poison of chauvinism, they are angrily turning rank-and-file Afrikaaners away from the party of P. Botha. They are filling the ranks of the Afrikaaner Resistance Movement and other ultra-rightist organizations that are the core of the opposition to any changes in South Africa. Armed with clubs, pistols and whips in hand, the storm troopers of the ARM are rushing to the "defense of the white race."

When their opponents were unarmed black demonstrators, the government of P. Botha had looked calmly at the "muscle flexing" of the Terreblanche youth, and had moreover used the ultra-rightists as a sort of counterbalance to the adherents of complete elimination of racist institutions. Balancing between the one and the other, the president was actually able to follow his tactic of cosmetic reforms without interference. But, as has been stated, the reforms he undertook in April and May of 1986 evoked a sharp increase in extremist sentiments among Afrikaaners.

Andries Treurnicht, leader of the extreme right-wing Conservative Party with 16 seats in parliament, declared openly that in South Africa "a movement has taken shape that cannot be stopped—a movement against reforms we do not need." He accused the government of P. Botha of bearing responsibility for the demonstrations of the Africans, since, having promised to carry out reforms, they had not foreseen consequences such as the rule of the black majority.

The situation became so serious that, according to reports of the Johannesburg FINANCIAL MAIL, several deputies in parliament from the Nationalist Party privately admitted a "loss of contact" with their voters. As confirmed by this same newspaper, even many adherents of the Conservative Party are inclined toward going over to the Afrikaaner Resistance Movement, which is forcing the leaders of that party to make their positions even more harsh.

The challenge of the ultra-rightists placed a difficult dilemma before P. Botha: either halt the efforts at appeasing the black majority with the aid of concessions and strengthen repressions, or continue the reforms and ultimately face the threat of a putsch from the "ultras." How could he fail to understand the categorical warning of E. Terreblanche regarding the "use of force," if the authorities as before "bow to the pressure of the African nationalists"?—not empty words. Several years ago the ARM created three militarized youth organizations whose members conduct training regularly, developing methods of street fighting. The ARM also has special caches across the country, some of which were recently discovered by the authorities. Whole arsenals of unregistered weapons and explosives are stored there. P. Botha undoubtedly remembers the circumstances of the "putsch" in the ranks of the Nationalist Party, one of whose leaders was he himself, as a result of which his predecessor, Balthazar Forster, was replaced.

In the South African political arena, the Afrikaaner Resistance Movement in and of itself, of course, still does not play a significant role. The point is, however, that its platform is practically identical to the platforms of two other extreme right-wing parties—the Conservative and the Resurrected Nationalist parties. Ideological kinship also joins the ARM with the mass of small pro-fascist groups operating in the country—"Wit Kommando," "The Movement to Save White South Africa," "The Afrikaaner People's Guard" etc. When they appear together, they are impossible to separate. The opinion has even been expressed in the local press that the extreme right-wing groups are more dangerous to the government than the uprising of black South Africans.

Perhaps alarming the government even more is the fact that the ARM has quite a few secret proponents in the army and the police, as well as the government apparatus and the civil services. As confirmed by several members of parliament from the Nationalist Party, there is obvious proof of the fact that the ARM is trying to establish

control over the schools, sports clubs, church parishes and city councils. Moreover, a number of ultra-rightist groups, among them "Wit Kommando," maintain close ties with neofascist parties abroad.

P. Botha cannot be suspected of intending to transfer real power to the African majority. Nonetheless, the signal from the conservative circles of the white community was unambiguous: the president has already done too much for the Africans and is now threatening the very foundations of white rule.

The prospect of a confrontation between the government and the ultra-rightists has caused even greater uncertainty among the white community regarding the future of the country. The Nationalist Party itself was not unified on the issue of how to react to the challenge of the extremists. An answer should have been made at the nationwide party congress in the middle of August 1986, whose results were not so difficult to foresee: after all, the government of P. Botha, little enough inclined toward radical reforms already, having introduced a state of emergency in South Africa as of 12 Jun 86, in fact ceded to the pressure of the "ultras."

The best method of eliminating the threat from the right is to take rightist positions oneself, knocking the ground out from under them. Which is what Piter Botha did. It is difficult to say with any certainty what happened in the lobbies of the congress, how intense the struggle was. And how important is it, really? It is important that P. Botha declared the intention of leading the Nationalist Party in preserving the system of apartheid. The South African government, he declared, "will not commit suicide" by capitulating to those who demand reforms that "will lead to the establishment of communist power." It could not be otherwise. In essence, the ruling Nationalist Party, the Afrikaaner Resistance Movement and others of that ilk stand on guard for the interests of the white minority.

The Nationalist Party moreover has always served as a breeding ground for neofascism. Arrant racism, the doctrine of "purity of race and blood," decades of culturing among its members, has attracted Nazi criminal refugees from Germany into the party. The neofascist ideas are deeply rooted among the wealthy Afrikaaners as a consequence of the efforts of such leaders of Hendrik Ferwerd and Balthazar Forster, who have praised the "theories" of Hitler.

The present-day retreat of the leadership of the Nationalist Party before the intrigues of the "ultras" allows it not to fear a blow from the right for a time. Moreover, support for the government of P. Botha among whites has grown in recent months due to the threat of international sanctions against South Africa. But this has in no way removed the danger of an outburst of neofascism in the country. On the contrary. In May of this year, a sort of testing of forces occurred. Behind the decision of P. Botha to hold special parliamentary elections in which

only whites participated could be clearly discerned a desire to show that he has an undisputed mandate to lead the country as before. The tactics of tacking and flirting with the "ultras" along with promises to hold the reins of government with a firm hand bore definite fruit: the Nationalist Party received 123 of the 166 elected seats. But did P. Botha receive the complete moral satisfaction he had been counting on? His party got 52.3 percent of the votes versus 57 percent in the preceding elections of 1981, and the extremist right candidates got 29 percent, or almost double that in 1981. The Conservative Party, increasing its representation in parliament from 16 to 22 seats, replaced the Progressive-Federalist Party as the chief opposition force. As a result, the "ultras" have acquired even greater confidence in themselves, and it cannot be ruled out that they will be able to attract new proponents. The climate of the state of apartheid remains favorable for the bacillus of the brown plague.

Footnote

1. This in no way signifies that the white residents of South Africa are divided only into racists and ultra-racists. There are quite a few people among them with liberal or progressive convictions, taking part in the fight against apartheid.—For more detail see: B. Bogdanov, "South Africa. Cracks in the 'Monolith' or a Myth Exploded?"—*AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA*, 1986, No 4.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1987. Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

12821

**Collective Monograph Examining Islam-Politics
Link Reviewed**

18070379h Moscow *AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA*
in Russian No 6, Jun 87 p 62

[Review "Islam and Politics" by Candidate of Historical Sciences M. Roshchin of book "Islam v sovremennoy politike stran Vostoka (konets 70-kh—nachalo 80-kh godov XX veka)" [Islam and the Contemporary Politics of the Countries of the Orient (End of the 1970s—Beginning of the 1980s). Editor-in-chief L.R. Polonskaya. Moscow, Oriental Literature Section of Nauka Publishing House, 1986, 279 pp]

[Text] The problem of the interrelationships of Islam and politics attracts the steady attention of Soviet Oriental scholars. These interrelationships are comprehensively considered in this collective monograph.

The historical roots of the interconnection of the Islamic religion and politics are very deep. As is well known, Muhammed was not only a leader and religious teacher, but also the founder of Muslim statehood. This specific nature of Islam was convincingly revealed by the book's authors. Only by being clearly aware of the communal

nature of the Muslim religion (the initial Muslim commune still seems to many contemporary Islamic ideologists to be the ideal state formation) is it possible to understand how Muslim stereotypes of concepts of power "continue to survive, having become adapted to new conditions" (p 34), the authors assert.

The ideo-political aspects of the "Islamic boom" are considered in a socio-economic context in the book. Of particular interest is the chapter devoted to the social shifts that preceded it in the Muslim countries. The profound changes that transpired in society as a result of the influence of such factors as growth in non-agricultural employment, urbanization and expansion of the sphere of hired labor sharply increased the political activeness of the new urban segments, which activity, as a rule, took place in the channels of the re-emergence of Muslim traditions. The comprehensive research of these processes favorably distinguishes the Soviet monograph from the research of Western scholars, who often consider the Muslim religion as something separate and self-sufficient, which undoubtedly distorts the true picture.

The book devotes serious attention to the ideological concepts of contemporary Muslim political movements. The Soviet scholars analyze in detail the social-class basis of the various political parties and organizations and clearly point out the main lines of the class watershed between bourgeois and petty-bourgeois trends. The phenomenon of a "resurrection" of fundamentalism, exceedingly typical of contemporary political life in the Muslim countries, inevitably comes into the field of view of the authors. What is the reason for the noticeable activation of the "fundamentalists"? How did the paradox of the re-emergence of traditions that has occurred in Muslim countries arise? The explanation the authors give for this phenomenon is quite convincing. "The dissemination of the idea of a 'resurrection' was associated to a large extent with the fact that its was namely the representatives of it that were able to create, thanks to a synthesis of organizational forms of traditional Muslim societies and contemporary Muslim parties, such organizations that could mobilize and direct the political activeness of the masses considerably more effectively than the modernist parties and the ulem parties" (p 83). This conclusion seems quite productive. Such a point of view in conducting concrete area-studies research makes possible a more profound evaluation of the prospects of fundamentalism as a distinct political movement.

A separate chapter of the monograph considers the ideo-political role of Islam in the socialist-oriented countries. Especial attention is devoted to resolving the Islamic problem in Afghanistan, where a counter-revolution has appeared under the banner of Islam. As is justly noted in the book, "making use of the miscalculations of the authorities in carrying out revolutionary-democratic transformations in the first stage of the revolution, the counter-revolutionary leaders, based on the Koran and the norms of Muslim law, are trying to

prove the incompatibility of the steps undertaken by the revolutionary authorities with Islam, while the worsening of the economic situation in the country is explained as the result of 'non-Islamic rule'" (p 247). As emphasized in the book, the revolutionary government is currently conducting active counter-propaganda in the sphere of religion and has undertaken a series of important steps to arrange normal mutual relations with the believers. I would add personally that another proof of the constructive and flexible policies of the government is the creation of an Islamic university in the country.

The historical process in the countries of the Orient is multifaceted and complex. In the Muslim states we often encounter both secular and "fundamentalist" ("resurrected") tendencies. Today the peak of the "Islamic

boom" has largely passed. Time itself will look around and evaluate its consequences. This is important both for an analysis of the recent past and for a precise determination of possible future prospects. The brilliant description of the political role of Islam in the countries of the Orient given in this book makes the work exceedingly topical and useful.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1987. Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

12821

Commentary on Neofascism in Western Europe
18070403a Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian
2 Aug 87 p 3

[Article by Captain M. Zhiglov: "The Descendants of the 'Browns'"]

[Text] "Please!" say politicians of West European countries when they are asked about the growth of neofascism in the West. "There is no such phenomenon here. We really understand what fascism is and struggle against any form in which it manifests itself." Unfortunately, the facts attest to just the opposite.

The neofascist party in Italy consists of about 400,000 members. Its influence is constantly growing there. The French "national front" received hundreds of thousands of votes in parliamentary elections. According to data from the democratic press, the FRG today has over 80 neofascist parties, unions, and groups, with over 20,000 members. The views of the new "Browns" are already shared by 13 percent of young West Germans. Neofascists have activated their work greatly in Austria, the U.S., Denmark, and Norway.

Rascals in black leather jackets with a swastika on the sleeve are direct participants in racial excesses, armed provocations, terrorist acts against democratic forces, and the campaign to rehabilitate fascist war criminals.

Detachments of neofascist storm troopers do not operate in various countries in isolation. More and more often they try to build a single "anticommunist front." The press bulletin of West Germany's Social Democratic Party, BLICK NACH RECHTS, pointed in this connection to extensive contacts between Western neofascists and their "spiritual brothers" of the organization of the National-Socialist German Workers' Party (NSDAP) [the Nazi Party] abroad, originating in Nebraska (U.S.). There is a steady flow from the U.S. to the FRG of money, leaflets, and labels with fascist slogans and symbols as well as of literature that praises violence and murder.

In Western Europe and the U.S. neofascism is gaining strength not in isolation. The general adjustment of the West's foreign and domestic policies, the strengthening of anticommunism and anti-Sovietism, the acceleration of the arms race—all of this creates a favorable climate for the germination of the neofascist seed.

This process is occurring under conditions in which authorities tolerate and even display an encouraging attitude toward political and other activities of neofascist organizations. There is no other way to explain, for example, the gatherings of neofascist rogues near the federal offices in the capital of the FRG. Despite the fact that democratic society has demanded that the government forbid the neofascist "march on Bonn," the police did not lift a finger to disperse Hitler's followers, who on 25 July insolently marched on city streets with fascist flags and swastikas.

Similar cases provide the basis for supposing that today's fascism is paving a road for itself simply because it is needed by government circles of capitalist countries. It is needed as a counterbalance to leftist forces, as a factor capable of drawing the attention of millions of people away from the topical problems of modern capitalist society and of making these people an obedient weapon in the hands of the governing classes. The inclusion of neofascism in the arsenal of political and ideological means for assaulting democratic rights and the freedoms of workers enables conservative rightwing circles to present a united front against the democratic domestic lives of their countries, against decreasing international tensions, and against the process of strengthening trust between states with different social structures.

Progressive society throughout the world recognizes more and more the serious danger being incurred by the recurrent wave of the "brown plague." Within the ranks of fighters for progress and democracy, demands are being made more and more insistently to do away with this pathology once and for all.

8228

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

12 Nov 87